UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
39001006682796

Proceedings of the Congress of Constructive Patriotism.

Proceedings of the Congress

OF

Constructive Patriotism

held under the auspices of

THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE

Washington, D. C.

January 25-27, 1917

Issued by

THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE, Inc.

31 Pine Street, New York

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Adopted at the Business Session of the Congress of Constructive Patriotism, Washington, January 27, 1917

This Congress of Constructive Patriotism, composed of American men and women representing all sections of the United States, has assembled at Washington believing that patriotism embodies not only the preservation of individual liberty but even more the spirit of service and sacrifice for the benefit of the whole people.

We are convinced that the time has come when all men and women throughout the country should be called upon to unite in recognizing the dangers which beset our Republic. We believe that our citizens, however patriotic and loyal, are nevertheless unprepared to defend our national integrity against other nations whose aspirations and theories of government may be in conflict with ours.

Current history teaches a convincing lesson in respect to the power of a united people. It is our ambition that the inspiration now filling the hearts of the men and women of foreign lands shall fill the hearts of our men and women during times of peace. We believe the perpetuation of our democratic form of government can be most firmly secured by the establishment of equal service of all citizens under which every man and woman, rich and poor, shall take an effective and responsible part; that through service to our country, civil and military, there shall flow a keener understanding of national duty and a wider comprehension of obligations of citizenship commensurate with the privileges and advantages which are ours.

28694

Therefore Be It Resolved:

PATRIOTISM THROUGH EDUCATION

1. We approve and heartily advocate the plans of the Committee on Patriotism Through Education of the National Security League to create in America an undivided and effective national spirit; to organize the individual and collective power of the nation so as to bring it to bear on national problems through democratic instrumentalities; to emphasize the nation's needs and opportunities so that each citizen will gladly give the necessary time to training for personal service whenever needed; and to establish a national morale and idealism through appeals to patriotism.

DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN FORCES

2. We approve and endorse the action taken by the National League for Women's Service for developing and co-ordinating the woman power of the United States for constructive patriotic work.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

3. Under our faulty military system of which the organized militia and the National Guard have been the chief victims, they have nevertheless contributed to keeping alive the spirit of military duty and patriotism in this nation.

They have been burdened with an unfair and disproportionate share of responsibility which we believe should henceforth be borne by all citizens alike.

We recommend, therefore, that the Patriotic and Defense Organizations here represented support the passage of Federal legislation based on the following general principles:

(a) Training for defense for all physically fit young men, prior to the age of twenty-one and preferably in the nineteenth year.

(b) The training to be intensive, continuous field or sea training for the period necessary to produce an efficient soldier or sailor.

(c) The system to be under exclusive Federal control.

(d) Obligation to serve in war as well as to train in time of peace.

MILITARY POLICY

4. We urge the establishment by the Federal Government of a proper military policy, together with the means of insuring its continuity in accordance with our system of government and that the necessary steps be at once taken to provide the troops and equipment necessary for an effective land defense. We recommend to the National Congress, in carrying this into effect, to adopt the judgment of our military authorities.

THE NAVY

5. Our Navy must be restored to the position of second naval power in the Atlantic, and simultaneously be made the first naval power in the Pacific; and we respectfully recommend to the National Congress that in carrying this into effect it adopt the judgment of our naval authorities.

INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS

6. We pledge our continued support to the Council of National Defense and the National Research Committee and to such agencies as are or may be created to foster a complete and effective co-operation between Governmental and private activities looking toward Preparedness for both peace and war.

GOVERNMENTAL EFFICIENCY

7. It is our belief that without the sacrifice of any democratic ideals our Government should inspire an increased measure of loyalty and national unity of purpose; that it should provide trained public leadership, always responsible to the electorate, under which there would be a marked increase in Governmental and individual efficiency. We earnestly request the President and Congress to make our Civil Service more efficient and to bring about the adoption of a national executive budget system.

AMERICANIZATION AND DUAL CITIZENSHIP

8. We advocate that an Americanization Campaign necessary to our effective national defense shall be carried on through three main channels: (a) Government, schools and courts; (b) Business and industry; (c) Individual citizens as neighbors; that every effort shall be made to stimulate the activities of those

agencies; and we urge our Government to treat with foreign powers to secure throughout the world the unified and unequivocal status of American citizens wherever born.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

9. The United States of America was called into being for the Common Defense and for the protection of the right of representative self-government by its people. During more than a century and a quarter we have tested and proved the value of this great inheritance. We hereby solemnly affirm our belief that the right of the individual to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as guaranteed by the Constitution and as rendered efficacious by the spirit of our forefathers is the basic principle of the Government of the United States. And we hold that in our relations with foreign governments we should continue to affirm and to defend these rights.

FIRST SESSION

3 P. M., Thursday Afternoon, January 25, 1917
New Willard Hotel

AMERICA'S PRESENT NEEDS

The Congress was called to order by Hon. J. M. Dickinson, of Chicago, who introduced the presiding officer.

MR. DICKINSON: The meeting will please come to order. The Congress will be opened by an invocation of the divine blessing by the Bishop of Washington, Rt. Rev. Alfred Harding.

INVOCATION

Rt. Rev. Alfred Harding, D.D., Bishop of Washington

Let us pray. Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we ask Thy blessing upon this Congress of Constructive Patriotism here assembled. We acknowledge with grateful heart Thy guiding hand in the past of this Nation and people. In the great crises of its history, Thou didst buoy up its leaders and inspire them with courage and wisdom to meet the greatest issues of their time.

Thou hast given us men, who, trusting in Thee, have never wavered in their cause of righteousness and truth at whatever cost of life and service. In times of darkness and divided counsels Thou didst give us men of vision and through their leadership and counsel didst bring us out of perplexity into the light, didst lead us out of the wilderness into a worthy place.

In this hour, day and generation, at a great crisis in the world's history, and at a turning point in the history of our nation, we beseech Thy guidance and Thy mighty aid. In the time of our prosperity, we beseech Thee, good Lord, deliver us from the mad pursuit of wealth and pleasure; deliver us from low

ideals of the meaning of life; from selfishness and unconcern for the welfare of our neighbor, from indifference to the cry for justice in this our own land and others. Give us a vivid realization of the place America should have in the world of nations, as a power for righteousness. Help us to realize our responsibility to recognize that we need to be strong and efficient, not only for defense against aggression, but strong and efficient to espouse the cause of the oppressed in every land.

Guide this Congress in its deliberations and resolves. Grant that from this meeting may go forth influences that may inspire our people with that true patriotism which is willing to make sacrifices of time and means and strength, that America may become strong and efficient and its flag and honor be the symbol of liberty under law, under power to be exercised only for righteousness. Help us to learn the lesson taught us by Thy Son, our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's.

All of which we ask in His name and for His sake who for love of country and love of man gave Himself for us in sublimest sacrifice and who taught us to pray for all our brethren and for all our needs:

Our Father who are in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever, Amen.

MR. DICKINSON: It is now my pleasing and honorable office to introduce to you the chairman of this session, the Honorable Alton B. Parker, of New York.

ADDRESS

Hon. Alton B. Parker of New York, Chairman

MR. PARKER: In July, 1914, there was a great convention on Mackinaw Island, composed of delegates appointed by the Governors of the states, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, by the various Provinces of Canada, and by delegates chosen by great organizations of men in both countries.

The object of the Convention was to make plans for the celebration of that which was then soon to become a fact, that along

the longest international boundary in the world, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with 3,840 miles of opportunity for trouble, there had been neither fort, gunboat or soldier for a period of a hundred years. It was expected, of course, by this celebration to cement more closely the ties which bind our northern neighbor and ourselves together; but beyond all that, it was hoped by many, if not all the men who were interested in the movement, to focus the attention of the two hundred and fifty national and international Peace Societies and the citizens of all countries upon the fact then demonstrated, that it was possible for two nations who so willed to live side by side, settling their differences—for many differences there have been between our northern neighbor and ourselves during this period of time —by treaties or by arbitration. When the Convention adjourned all the delegates were in high hopes for the future and for the usefulness which it was hoped this demonstration would prove to be to mankind—for there was not a war cloud in sight, no, not even as large as a man's hand; and yet within three weeks from the date of the adjournment of that Congress, six nations were at war.

It was like a bolt from the blue. It illustrated again and in most striking fashion that no man knows what the morrow will bring forth. Aye, that morrow saw Belgium, buttressed by treaties with everyone of the nations about her, guaranteeing her integrity and independence, overrun by a great army which struck right and left, and spared not.

England had the greatest navy in the world, aye, the greatest in the history of the world, and yet in the matter of land forces and air forces and munitions and the development of the country along lines which would make it effective in the case of a war, she was weak and unprepared. As for Russia, her condition was pitiable. Indeed, her condition was such as furnishes the answer to the statesman who preached to our people that "you need not be prepared, for upon the call of the President an army of a million men can be raised over night." (Laughter.) Aye, millions. Nay! millions of Russia's men are among the dead, the missing, the wounded, and the large majority of them sacrificed because their country was not prepared even with rifles—let alone cannon and shells and other munitions necessary at this time for the use of a great army.

The progress of the war soon disclosed to you and to the thoughtful and intelligent people of this country, that the United States was not prepared to resist any great power. To our amazement then we found that we had not a single fast battle cruiser or warship, and that in the matter of aeroplanes and submarines we were simply impotent. We were weak in these and many other directions in face of the fact that our leaders in the Departments of War and the Navy, had appealed to us long before to make preparations. It was insisted, however, in the face of thousands of people who marched in procession in the great cities of the United States with a view of interesting the government, that it was unnecessary for us to take any action. Why, it was said, and over and over again, that "All you need to do to keep out of war is to follow in the footsteps of righteousness and cultivate a christian spirit."

China tried that method. She followed in the footsteps of righteousness, and cultivated the spirit of Confucius for centuries, and in the end four different countries took a piece of her territory. She had four hundred millions of men and wealth enough to so prepare herself that she could have lived as she wished and wishes, in peace, but she followed, instead of the method of preparation, the advice "be good and then the world will let you alone," and now, no one knows what the future has in store for China.

We, too, are a peace-loving people. We propose to continue our efforts for the peace of the world. Nothing can dissuade you and me from hoping and working for that higher state of civilization in which the great controversies between nations may be settled precisely as they are settled to-day between citizens all over the world, and as we settle great controversies in this country between states, some of them the equivalent of nations in their size. There is no land that we covet. Our mission is not in the direction of the acquisition of property. We secured Cuba as the result of war, but we did not keep it. We gave it back to the people who lived in it and upon it, and helped them besides. That which we did to Cuba and with Cuba, represents the spirit of the American people. We wish no other land, no other possession but our own. We are proud of this government of ours which the fathers founded; a government, the like of which the world has never seen, although there have been republics before. We have watched its growth as a gov-

ernment by the people and under the Constitution which the fathers devised and framed; we have seen our schoolhouses dot every hillside and our colleges and our universities become the pride of everybody in our land. We have seen, too, the problems of democracy as they have developed. There are more of them. You and I are conscious that the future has in store for us still other difficult problems, as we have had them in the past, but we believe—I am sure you do; I know I do from my heart—that our people will intelligently work out the solutions of those problems as they shall arise and that far down in the history to come, we shall find this Nation of ours working on the problems of humanity in such a way as to interest and benefit all mankind.

So it is not for covetousness, but it is for the benefit of humanity that you are here, and when at home, struggling for the preservation of this country, which down to now has rendered tremendous service to mankind.

In order that we may continue the work here, it is absolutely necessary as a part of our scheme that we shall insure our sons, our grandsons and our families, our brothers and sisters, our wives and our children, against destruction by war, just as we now insure our homes against destruction by fire. But, it is said, we ought to do this if we can do it without costing money. It costs money to insure our government and our youths and our families against destruction by war, just as it costs us money to insure our buildings against destruction by fire, although we do not expect them to burn. It is true that it will cost us money, but what of it? We have the money; we have one hundred and eighty-seven billions of wealth, more than Great Britain, Ireland and Germany all put together had at the beginning of the war, and yet we hesitate about a little insurance money in order to save our properties and families!

And what is war; what is money, anyway, when weighed in the scale against the lives of the young men of the United States of this or any other generation, and against the freedom from suffering and anxiety of the mothers, the wives and children? Mere dross.

In taking up the serious problems which are confronting the Congress it will be well for you to bear in mind that local selfishness and individual selfishness, the lack of oneness in our national

life, must be corrected. (Applause.) It must be corrected if we would make the Union one and inseparable, effective, in working out the purposes that are absolutely essential to our defense and our protection.

A year and a half after this great war broke out, in December, 1915, an incident occurred which points out at once many directions to your mind in which there might be trouble without regard to classes and without regard to employments.

You will remember that in that month of December, 1915, two hundred thousand miners struck in Wales, England, and in the west of England. It only required a couple of months of non-work on the part of two hundred thousand men to win the war against the country to which they owed allegiance.

England had to have coal for her Navy, for her ships that were bringing food products from all over the world; she had to have coal to support France, which had lost the ability to reach its own coal mines, and yet when two hundred thousand men refused to work it was only by an appeal of Lloyd George that they were at least induced to go back. I need not stop to characterize this situation; it furnishes its own characterization, but it seems to me to invite us to a consideration of the necessity of inspiring the patriotism of our people, of all classes, all occupations, to the end that should any such problem present itself to the people of the United States, we will at least present a united and loyal front. (Applause.)

One more word, ladies and gentlemen: It should not be overlooked that the leader of the movement in which we are engaged is the President of the United States. We have not forgotten, and we never shall be able to forget, that in the months that we were muddling along after this war had disclosed our impotence in many directions, so far as protection is concerned, that it seemed to be impossible to interest many members of Congress in the direction of making what seemed to be needy appropriations for our strength. The reason for it was perfectly plain. It was not the objection of the members of Congress; it was the objection of their constituencies who were unwilling, because they could not see much beyond their noses, to contribute toward the defense of the United States as a whole. Then, you will remember, the President went out into many of those states and made a presentation of the situation to the people, and an appeal to them. When he came back you and I knew that his

appeal to reason had won the first victory for our cause, the cause of peace for ourselves throughout all the future, to be secured and assured by such thoroughness of preparation that no nation on earth will dare to attack us. (Applause.)

I have now the great pleasure of introducing to you the chairman of the Committee on this Congress. I should say just a word to you about him before I introduce him. He was the first President of the National Security League. I will venture to say that no man in the United States in the last two or three years has given more whole-hearted and effective service to a great cause than he. (Applause.) Without fee or reward, or the hope of it, putting aside quite too often undoubtedly, his clients think, the great controversies they submit to him, he has worked as a patriot for the solution of the problems which bring you here. I now take great pleasure in introducing him, Mr. S. Stanwood Menken. (Loud applause.)

FOREWORD OF THE CONGRESS OF CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTISM

S. Stanwood Menken, of New York, Chairman of the Committee on the Congress

MR. MENKEN: We are here because it is time that Americans should do more for America, and because we feel the call to service. We recognize that the privileges of American citizenship carry obligations which we are ready to meet. We are not willing to take from our country without giving to it. We wish to serve, whatever the call of duty may be. It is not our desire by such service to establish the spirit of militarism, for we do not advocate it, nor is our concept of service the creation of a world power for our country, for we do not crave it. Our only wish is to help upbuild the nation so as to insure its institutions and preserve individual liberty, not only for ourselves and our children, but for all civilization. We feel that the immediate objective of Americans should be to prove the success of democracy and its ability to maintain an efficient government for a contented people, according to the spirit and purpose of the founders of the Republic. When America does this it will have reached its highest destiny.

To-day we come together, not to criticise our country but with pride in it and with a recognition of its full possibilities, determined to apply those powers with the same success for the nation's upbuilding that we have heretofore utilized for individual achievement.

When we met a year ago our main purpose was to discuss the country's military unpreparedness and our inability to withstand attack from any first-class power. That effort was well worth the labor put upon it, not alone by the League but by many other organizations, and as a result the public has learned certain facts. At this Congress these matters will be taken up again by authorities who will bring home to you some truths which have an unpleasant sound especially as a statement of the facts as to our defenses will carry with it the conclusion that through neglect of one administration after another, our country is enjoying its possessions with peace to-day merely because of the conscience or of the policy of foreign nations. This is intolerable, and I respectfully submit to you that the primary consideration of this gathering must be immediate national insurance. Now, as a year ago, we are determined not to allow any gambling with the integrity of any part of these United States or with the safety of any American lives, and we should speak our views with directness and vigor.

Heretofore we have placed the blame for our unpreparedness on each political party in turn; yet for over two years, while we have been talking, our President has been importuning Congress, and still the net results of his efforts and ours is that we have had the failure of the Hay Bill, redolent with the treasonable injection of "pork"; a Navy Bill fairly good in scope and design but uncertain of execution, and liberal appropriations for fortifications and ammunition. We have gained nothing during all of this precious time that provides a definite means for the successful defense of this land. As partial defense and partial preparedness is, in terms of modern war, no defense, we submit that unless steps already taken are supplemented at once by legislation that will meet these requirements, our work will be ineffective, and the money already expended become a useless waste and burden upon a public that is already very heavily taxed. The root of the difficulty is that Congress has so far refused to meet the demands of the Excutive. Notwithstanding the splendid efforts on the part of many Congressmen of both

parties the results are most alarming. We want immediate compliance by Congress with President Wilson's recommendations. In view of the difficulties affecting the defense problem, its many sides, its economic phases, and the necessity for the matter to be given the concentrated attention of Congress at a time when nothing else is before it, I submit we should by proper resolution request the President to convene Congress in extra session for the sole purpose of solving the problem of defense. There should be no politics in this labor. If this is done we can rely upon you to serve notice upon your Congressmen, from the North, the South, the East and the West, that if America is to be protected at all you want immediate and actual defense, and that you will not tolerate further delay.

Coupled with the question of defense we must consider universal obligatory military training and service.

We of the Security League are pledged to support it because we believe it is the only means of providing an efficient and economic force necessary to defend our country at all times. We believe universal obligatory training and service will make for individual and industrial efficiency, provide for mutual understanding between the classes and increase the physical resources of those who serve; but above all, because it will give to us a democratic army on an economical basis it will furnish an army of the people which should be the only one in a Republic.

The question of how to meet the particular difficulties of the situation requires considerable thought. We are by no means blind to the many sides of this question. It should be taken up with an open mind at the special conference of Defense Societies which will meet to-morrow to supplement the work which has already been seriously entered into, and I know that in presenting any suggestion for a Bill, they will give due consideration to the temper and necessities of the whole people. Personally I hope that if any plan for Universal Military Training and Service is approved by you, it will be with a recommendation for educational features which will give to those who are fortunate enough to serve a further return by way of equipment through instruction on subjects which will enable them to better understand the problem of American life and to better serve the Nation as citizens in peace as well as in war. I say "fortunate enough to serve," because as I understand it, universal military training, if adopted, means that the state will provide for the youth of our

land a glorious opportunity of six months of life at the expense of the Government, under conditions of healthful exercise, the best of comradeship and good fellowship, which will give to them an endowment of good health that will last them through life. I say "fortunate" because I believe that we should discuss the question of universal military training as a great boon or privilege to be bestowed by the Government on its people, not as a burden or a tax, but as a gift the blessings of which will radiate throughout our national life. Men who are permitted to enjoy its advantages should rejoice, and develop that same spirit of patriotism which makes the heroes of Europe, whether of England, France or Germany, sing in the trenches and appreciate the beauty and poetry of patriotism.

Instruction should not be limited to those who have the good fortune to partake of military training. The fact is that an analysis of what constitutes true preparedness, after two years of thought, brings us to the conclusion that knowledge by the people of the needs of the Nation is the best foundation for national security. We Americans are to-day advancing at a tremendous rate in point of general information and individual and industrial efficiency, largely because the several states have enforced upon the young of the land compulsory training and service in educational institutions. As a people we have the greatest patriotism when the occasion is apparent, but unfortunately the citizens have not generally seen the sub-surface necessity of applying the ability characteristic of their industrial and commercial life to public affairs. As states must advance or fall according to the amount of service given to them by their citizens, and as the law of the survival of the fittest applies to nations as well as to individuals, we must frankly recognize the fact that if America is to prove itself the fittest to survive it can only be by the American people awakening to a full understanding of the requirements of their country and meeting the same by direct personal effort. We can no longer have government by proxy.

The work, however, of bringing knowledge to a hundred million people is no task for amateurs. It cannot be accomplished unless we, who want to do constructive work through this Congress, think in terms of organization. It will, therefore, be suggested to you that there be formed a national lecture system, under the auspices of the League, the primary details of which are being considered by Professor Hart and his associates, and

will be taken up by your Committee on Patriotism through Education. Such a lecture system should be under the control of an expert, accustomed to present serious subjects to large audiences in a popular way, with the aid of the stereopticon, the movies and the chart, on topics such as: The diplomatic position of the United States; the need of Americanization and a united national spirit; conservation; hygienic preparedness; industrial safeguards; lessons of our history; national defense; the advantages of mobilization of industries; foreign trade; methods of foreign governments, commercial and administrative; the peril of inefficiency and its cost to the individual and to the nation.

If I might amplify the idea, I would like to point out to you the possibilities of a lecture, say, on the Monroe Doctrine. The audiences could be taken with the aid of the screen to South America; landed at an important port; transported through the rubber forests and coffee plantations; shown the riches and the squalor of the cities, with their churches and their schools; the fertile and the arid spots, and, then, going around the Cape, given a vision of the priceless wealth of Chile, its copper mines and its nitrate fields; and being shown that not even the surface of South America, its productivity and its possibilities for the homing or feeding of mankind have been touched, we could explain to our audiences the great need for the development of South America by itself through our aid, or for allowing nations to develop it.

We could also explain the extent to which domestic trade would be aided by such a course and its benefits to our people, all with the permanence of our friendly relations with sister Republics most sacredly safeguarded without aggression; but above all we could bring home the fact that we have even a higher duty than that of providing material prosperity, namely that of maintaining the principles of individual liberty in all America for all time, and, above everything, the spiritual point of view of the benefit of maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine. If we see these duties, and are to assume these obligations, we must have knowledge of them, a united view of their importance and the physical strength to support them.

In other talks, we could explain the perils, the costs, the menace and the evil to an individual through government inefficiency and the Pork barrel, the direct deprivation to each citizen through waste by the government, and the decadence

resultant from legislative immorality, with reference to the loss of precious American lives through failure to safeguard against preventable disease and industrial injuries; focussing public attention on the fact that the preservation of national resources and the proper application of the returns from taxation is the best guarantee of national security to a united people of high ideals and the vigilant of their rights.

The fact that these questions of legislative action are related to politics forces me to call your attention to one other matter. I believe that we may be able, through this Congress, to give an impetus to constructive work by the political parties. The political party to-day is an anachronism; it fulfills no general useful purpose except to forward the views of a few national leaders and provide for the nomination of officeholders. The main concern of parties should be the development and achievement of policies. In the ordinary well-oiled political convention the platform is made "to run on." It is often conceived in the dead of night, and drafted by some ready phrase maker who has continually before him the motto "Party Safety First." The platform itself is adopted in the party convention merely because "the powers that be" ask one worthy henchman to move and another to second it. It is not to be wondered at that the platform fails to be the source of any inspiration for political activity; the people have had no part in its making and do not believe in it.

My suggestion is that the function of the political party must be so extended as to provide the means of direct contribution by the party to the achievement of policies for the benefit of the nation. I therefore suggest to you a concrete plan, may I say a constructive plan, for work of political parties, which I believe it is essential that we consider if we are going to find a direct application for the knowledge which we wish to instill through the Lecture Bureau of the League in the minds and hearts of the American people. It is as follows:

National committees of both the Democratic and Republican Party should require, by proper resolution, the country or city organizations throughout the land to meet once a year to discuss local needs and determine measures that they were ready to support to advance local interests. Similar conventions should be held every two years, lasting perhaps two days, to discuss

state requirements and measures to forward them. Every four years a national gathering should be held, under the auspices of the national committees, to consider national needs and determine what the party would do to meet them. In each case these meetings should be held at least two months prior to the meetings for nomination; and the personnel should be so provided for as to include not only the members of the machine, but also the most prominent men, ordinarily aligned with party, in all walks of life. Continuity of effort towards exact knowledge as to mooted questions and direct contributions of the parties to efficient government can be provided by each meeting appointing standing committees, which would be made up of experts on different subjects, of local, state or national endeavor, which would report at the following gathering. This plan would mean the destruction of invisible government, insofar as it affected the making of plans, and would develop political genius, eliminating the demand for the referendum, besides stimulating a healthy public interest in political matters.

I had the honor to organize one gathering in New York State that had a very beneficial effect. That meeting had in it not alone the local politicians, but the independent who never even thought of associating himself with a party convention, and the result of this combination was so impressed upon the public mind as to achieve party success at the polls. I am of the opinion that if this plan was instituted the parties would find that it would bring to the gatherings I have just mentioned the very best men in the city, state and nation, and that we would have the flower of citizenship present from each organization. The result would be that the best minds of each organization would be devoted to worthy political purpose and we would obtain efficient government. Instead of having our campaigns descend into one of personality rather than of principle, we would have a contest between the advocates of ideas and ideals which would re-establish party government and be a permanent stimulus for the greater growth of the nation.

In suggesting these matters I do so not to exclude many other interesting ones presented in the program for consideration by you, who are delegates from 350 public bodies. I would, however, impress upon you that at this time, when the world is in the making, when the forces outside and inside are so great, your very meeting here becomes a serious matter, because

by assuming a consideration of these questions you have accepted a duty. This duty is as great in this time of peace as any that you could have in time of war. In fact its effect is more far-reaching, and it should be our purpose in considering these matters to allow no narrow or personal view, no bias or prejudices of any kind to enter into our discussions, but we should remember that we have big things to do and not be disturbed by the little ones. We have here to-day as great an opportunity of forwarding the life of our republic, of increasing the power of this nation, and of maintaining our ideals of liberty, as did our forefathers at any other period of stress in our history. Let us enter upon the work with the same single purpose of service to our country, and let us do it with the confidence of successful achievement. (Loud applause.)

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott, the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Program, will now make a report of the Committee.

MR. ABBOTT: I am very sorry to say, Ladies and Gentlemen, that on behalf of the Committee on Program I have to make one or two dry, but none the less important announcements. As Mr. Menken has said, the platform of a political party is an important matter, so the resolutions of this Congress are an important matter, and the Committee which has those resolutions in charge is one of the important Committees of the Congress.

The Committee on Plan and Scope has appointed the following Committee on Resolutions:

Guy Murchie, Boston, *Chairman.*
Lawrence F. Abbott, New York.
Robert Bacon, New York.
Herbert Barry, New York.
Franklin Q. Brown, New York.
George Louis Beer, New York.
Arthur E. Bestor, Chicago.
Jacob M. Dickinson, Chicago.
W. T. Ellis, Philadelphia.
Franklin H. Giddings, New York.
Alexander Gordon, New York.
Hayden B. Harris, New York.
D. J. Haff, Kansas City, Mo.
C. Willing Hare, Philadelphia.
Ralph D. Mershon, New York.
S. Stanwood Menken, New York.
Charles Nagel, St. Louis.
Raymond B. Price, New York.
Arthur W. Page, New York.
George Wharton Pepper, Philadelphia.
Henry L. Stimson, New York.
Albion W. Small, Chicago.
Willet M. Spooner, Milwaukee, Wis.
Lawrence D. Tyson, Knoxville, Tenn.
August H. Vogel, Milwaukee, Wis.

Albert Bushnell Hart, Boston.
Evan Hollister, Buffalo.
Hennen Jennings, Washington, D. C.
Carl R. Latham, Chicago.
Bascom Little, Cleveland, Ohio.
Charles E. Lydecker, New York.
H. H. Merrick, Chicago.
Mrs. Lindsay Van Rensselaer, New York.
Miss Maude Wetmore, New York.
Henry A. Wise Wood, New York.

Robert Morris, Philadelphia.
S. P. Wetherill, Jr., N. J.
Secretaries.

I am also requested to announce the appointment of chairmen of sub-committees, as follows:

Chairman of the Sub-Committee on International Relations:
DAVID JAYNE HILL, Former Ambassador to Germany.

Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Patriotism through Education:
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Professor of Government, Harvard University.

Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Governmental and Individual Efficiency:
FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND, Director Bureau of Municipal Research.

Chairman of Sub-Committee on the Army:
FREDERIC L. HUIDEKOPER, Author of "The Military Unpreparedness of the United States," Washington, D. C.

Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Navy:
J. BERNARD WALKER, Editor Scientific American, Author of "America Fallen."

Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Americanization:
RAYMOND B. PRICE, of New York.

Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Woman's Work:
MISS MAUDE WETMORE, of New York.

The chairman of the sub-committee on Universal Military Training and Service will be chosen at the meeting of the sub-committee to be held in conjunction with the conference of representatives of Patriotic and Defense Societies.

The Committee on Plan and Scope has formulated certain rules, which I am requested to announce, as follows:

RULES

1. The floor of the Congress of Constructive Patriotism is open only to those believing in Preparedness through the creation of a military and naval establishment capable of successfully defending this country, and to advocates of that constructive patriotism of personal service which will create in America an undivided and effective

national spirit. The Congress is an open forum for those believing in these general principles.

2. A Committee on Resolutions shall be appointed, consisting of two members of each of the following Committees, designated by the Committee on Congress:

International Relations
Army
Navy
Patriotism Through Education
Universal Training
Americanization
Women's Work

in addition to the Vice-Presidents and Secretary of the League ex-officio.

3. All resolutions introduced in the Congress shall be referred to the Committee on Resolutions without reading or debate. Cushing's Manual shall cover proceedings.

4. All speakers not specifically invited to address the Congress shall be strictly limited to five minutes' discussion, and shall not be allowed to speak a second time at the same session except by unanimous consent.

5. A motion to close the discussion shall not be debatable.

This League is a non-political body. It has invited men and women of distinction to speak as Americans for America without presuming, even by suggestion, to influence their utterances. Their views are personal, and do not bind the Congress or the National Security League unless approved through the adoption of appropriate resolutions.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: The next speaker, as Secretary of War, as Secretary of State, and Senator of the United States, has written his name high up on the scroll of statemanship, to a height unsurpassed in my judgment by any other statesman in my time. (Applause.)

He voluntarily left his high office in the United States Senate and went back home not to rest but to continue his patriotic service in behalf of the people in private life.

He achieved his great distinction as a statesman, not alone because of his ability, which was unsurpassed by his fellows, but also because he had a great patriotic heart, imbued with a love of the people and convinced that there is no government on the face of the earth that is to be compared with ours. (Applause.)

Now, that he is back in private life, almost daily in some direction always helpful to the public, his voice is heard in behalf of causes which only patriots help along.

I have the pleasure of introducing to you the Honorable Elihu Root. (Loud Applause.)

AMERICA'S PRESENT NEEDS

Address of Elihu Root, of New York, former Secretary of State

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I find that I am set down upon the program to speak upon America's present needs. I should not have dignified the few remarks that I have to make by any such stupendous title. I will make one observation, however, upon the subject. It is that America's present need is a reawakening of the spirit of a free self-governing democracy. And unless we are to wait until some great and terrible misfortune brings that awakening, each one of us, whose eyes are open to the condition and the demands of the times, must do his utmost to render his service and awaken his fellows.

Now I wish I could say something—I would like to say something, not so much to lead or to convince you, whose eyes are already open, and who have come here because they are open, but something that will enable you, when you go home, to stir your fellow countrymen, men and women, out of the lethargy into which they have fallen, a lethargy in which they assume that liberty and justice come as the air, without effort and need no service and no sacrifice for their perpetuation, a lethargy in which the more material things of life fill the needs and the wants, and to have a fat and increasing income and swell the millions of automobiles in the country seems to be the mission of the American Republic. We have reached this condition of indifference and sluggish patriotism through decadence. As life has grown easier sacrifice has grown harder. As we have grown rich in material things we have grown poor in spirit.

The original theory of our American Government was the theory of universal service. Let me read you how the fathers of the Republic conceived that American independence and American freedom were to be preserved. I read from the Militia Act of May 8, 1792—and you will perceive here that the Act is based upon the principle of universal compulsory preparation for public defense. The quaint old phrases of the Act may serve to impress upon your minds the changes of condition to

which the principle is to be applied, while they may serve to enforce the memory of the principle. These are its provisions:

"Every able-bodied male citizen of the respective states, resident therein, who is of the age of eighteen years and under the age of forty-five years shall be enrolled in the militia. It shall be the duty of every captain or commanding officer of a company to enroll every such citizen residing within the bounds of his company, and all those who may from time to time arrive at the age of eighteen years, or who, being of the age of eighteen years and under the age of forty-five years, come to reside within his bounds.

"Each captain or commanding officer shall without delay notify every such citizen of his enrollment by a proper non-commissioned officer of his company, who may approve the notice, and any notice or warning to a citizen enrolled to attend a company, battalion or regimental muster which is according to the laws of the state in which it is given, for that purpose shall be deemed a legal notice of his enrollment. Every citizen shall, after notice of his enrollment, be constantly provided with a good musket or firelock of a bore sufficient for balls of the eighteenth part of a pound; a sufficient bayonet and belt, two spare flints; and a knapsack, a pouch with a box therein to contain not less than twenty-four cartridges suited to the bore of his musket or firelock, each cartridge to contain a proper quantity of powder and ball; or, with a good rifle, knapsack, shot pouch and powder horn, twenty balls suited to the bore of his rifle, and a quarter of a pound of powder.

"And shall appear armed, accoutered and provided when called out to exercise or into service." Except only—"Except that when called out on company days to exercise only he may appear without a knapsack.

"And all arms, ammunition and accoutrements so provided and required shall be held exempt from all suits, distress, executions or sales for debt or for the payment of taxes.

"Each commissioned officer shall be armed with a sword or hanger, and spontoon.

"The militia of each state shall be arranged into divisions, brigades, regiments, battalions and companies, as the legislature may direct. It shall be the duty of the Adjutant-General in each state to make return of the militia of the state with their arms, accoutrements and ammunition, agreeably to the provisions of law, to the President of the United States annually, and on or before the first Monday in January. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War from time to time to give such directions to the Adjutant-Generals of the militia as may in his opinion be necessary to produce a uniformity in such returns.

"A system of discipline and field exercise which is ordered to be observed in the different corps of infantry, artillery, and riflemen, of the Regular Army, shall also be observed in such corps respectively of the militia."

Now what we are talking about in the meetings that have led up to this Congress is a return to the original *basic principle upon which this Government was founded.* There were rapid changes in conditions after this old, early Act. We gradually became relieved of the pressure of contiguous possible enemies. With the purchase of Louisiana in 1803 the France of Napoleon disappeared from our border. With the acquisition of Florida in 1819, Spain withdrew from the continental limits of the present United States, and we no longer looked at Spanish soldiers across an imaginary border line. With the settlement of the Northeastern boundary controversy, in the Webster-Ashburton treaty of 1842, and with the Oregon boundary settlement in 1846, all cause of controversy with Great Britain upon our northern frontier disappeared. With the gradual pressing out of the settlers, occupation of Indian lands, and pressing back of the Indians, the danger of the Indian wars to the great settled States upon the Atlantic seaboard became far distant, and that great race question which agitated the men of the early days disappeared. We grew in numbers vastly and became so numerous that for any of the ordinary wars as they occurred in the nineteenth century, it seemed unnecessary that all the people of all the States should hold themselves prepared in accordance with the principles of this Act of 1792. Enough could be raised at any time to constitute an army of the size which was customary for the wars of that period. The spirit of adventure would lead young men enough to come to the front to engage in ordinary small wars, like, for instance, the Mexican War. And, finally, we came to the point where all this duty was completely changed, and the old militia service disappeared. About fourteen years ago a new experiment was tried. During this period of the gradual occultation of militia service the States had found that they needed some organized force for what was practically police duty, and from that need the National Guard arose. It was not that the States expected to engage in war with anybody, but because they must have an organized force, and about fourteen years ago the effort was made to utilize that organized force as a means of furnishing instruction to young Americans, which would give them, in case they were called to volunteer for military service, the A, B, C of that service. In all our wars we have suffered dreadfully from the fact that outside of the small Regular Army our volunteers had to be officered by men, taken out

of the workshop, the law office, the store, the farm, good men, but wholly, wholly untrained in military life and military duty; and no one can measure the loss of life which occurred in our Civil War because the young men who were sent on to the battlefields were led by officers wholly ignorant of their duties.

The attempt then was made to treat the National Guard as an organized militia, to require its organization, its discipline, its armament, to conform to that of the Regular Army, give it instructors from the Regular Army, have it exercise in manœuvers and in camps with the Regular Army and contribute out of the national Treasury towards its support and instruction, and that process has been going on for the last fourteen years.

It now appears, however, I think with great certainty, that that process cannot produce more than a comparatively small number of men who are trained so that they have even the elements of military service. The National Guard has not increased very much during the whole period that has elapsed since the so-called Dick Bill that made the arrangements for this joint instruction and joint exercise.

So we find ourselves in this situation, that we have not yet secured any real substitute for the old universal service that is adequate to any very great military operation. But, in the meantime, the science of war has changed, and the relations of armies and navies to the other peoples of the earth have changed so that we have an entirely new and different problem. In the old days nations used to send out armies composed of but a very small part of the population, and those armies used to look for each other and fight each other, and, when they got through, there would be a peace made, which would result in some little changes, sometimes of consequence and sometimes of very little consequence, but the great mass of the people were not very much affected. The great mass of the people took but little part in it.

But, now, war has become a conflict of entire nations against each other and we see to-day the whole people of England and the whole people of France and the whole people of Germany and of Austria, engaged in actual participation in the conflict. Now, with that kind of war, our little provision of a small Regular Army and a small National Guard is entirely incompetent to deal. We have already discovered that we cannot get through volunteering any considerable increase. There are not enough

with all the interest in preparation for defense, to fill up the ranks of our Regular Army or to fill up the ranks of our National Guard. The reason is that the spirit of adventure isn't adequate to furnish the soldiers.

That same thing has proven true before. In 1812 we had to come to a draft. We tried to fight that war with volunteers, volunteers in the regulars and volunteers in the militia, and we were unable to do it and we came to a draft and we made a terrible mess of it. In the Civil War we had to come to a draft. We tried to fight it with volunteers. The South appreciated the difficulty in 1862 and started on a draft then. We waited until 1863, when we took recourse to conscription. Whenever the real stresses come, since we have abandoned the old universal system of this Act of 1792, the volunteer system has proved to be insufficient to answer the purpose. And now, a thousand times more, will it be incompetent when whole nations engage in war. War is changing in another respect. It has become vastly more scientific and the instruments of warfare have gone out of sight from the old hanger and spontoon of the Act of 1792. High explosives and machine guns, and breech-loading cannons, and great field pieces that are sufficient to batter down the mightiest fortifications, and submarines, and airships, and deadly gases, and spurting flames, and scores of other devices of science, have created a situation in which this volunteer million which is going to rise up when the President calls for the defense of America, stand no more chance against a disciplined and trained army than the poor Mexicans did against Cortez, when he went through Mexico; than the poor Fuzzy-Wuzzy, that first-rate fighting man, stood against the British square, or the American Indians with their bows and arrows stood against the regulars that drove them step by step from their ancient possession. We would be to-day, if engaged in war, with our million patriots in the position of the helpless savage fighting against the trained forces of civilization.

It is not necessary to come even to this time for that, for here we should remember, when we are talking about the defense of country, how here the British troops captured Washington and burned the Capitol and White House, marching from the Chesapeake here against an American army many times their number. Why? These men, whom Madison drove out to see and in front of whose rout he drove rapidly back, were the sons

of the men who fought at Bunker Hill and Saratoga and Yorktown, and they were the fathers of the men who fought at Gettysburg and Shiloh. They were as brave, as manly, as their fathers or their sons, but they fled before a force of men of the same race, far, far inferior in number. Why? Because they didn't know how to fight. They were helpless as a sheep before a wolf. They didn't know how. A little training beforehand would have taught them how.

Now there is one other thing of vast importance and that is, that not only must men learn how but they must be supplied. Armies must have food and shoes and clothes and rifles to take the places of those that are broken and lost, and ammunition to take the place of that which is fired away, and cannons, and all the vast range of scientific appliances with which they may hold their own in battle. They must be transported. The high explosives require the use of many, many ingredients, not common. All of this vast supply, this supply upon which one-half the world is engaged to-day while the other half is using it in war, this vast supply must be provided from raw materials, and, in order that it may be made, people must know how to make it and must be trained in making it. People must know where the raw materials are to be obtained and how to obtain them. And so there must be an industrial training, industrial organization, industrial preparation, as well as the provision of men. And beyond all that, when war comes, people have got to live. The industrial and financial processes of the country have got to go on and, if they are to go on notwithstanding the vastly disturbing forces of war, which break up all the common usual relations and occupations, people have got to be trained in industry. They have got to have the spirit of industry. They have got to have the spirit which will lead them to work, although they are no longer making profits. They have got to have the spirit which will lead them to exercise their industry to do what they can, each in his way and in her way, to continue the life of the country, because they wish to serve their country. That means, not merely the organization of an army, but it means the organization of a nation. No army and no nation can be effectively organized unless the spirit is within it which gives it motive power.

Well, now, why all this? Why need we disturb ourselves? I think that is the great trouble. I think that the great obstacle you men and women of this Congress have to meet in the coun-

try is the fact that a great mass of the people of the country don't believe a word of it, don't believe there is any necessity of our talking about it, don't believe the trouble is ever going to come. To be sure we have had wars all along, one in a little over every twenty years during our entire history. It is nineteen years now since the last, and we are due to have one pretty soon. But they don't believe that anything is going to happen. Now that is the trouble with preparation. If the people of the United States thought that there was any real danger of somebody's attacking us they'd wake up soon enough and get ready. But they don't. So they turn the cows out to pasture and are no more disturbed about things than the cows. Well, let us look at the condition of affairs in the world. We did think that things were getting better. We had high hopes that the forces that make for peace, the public opinion of civilized man, and the values to civilized man of uninterrupted commerce were continually making war less probable. But we have had a rude awakening.

The present war which is raging in Europe was begun upon an avowal of principles of national action that no reasonable and thoughtful neutral ought to ignore. The central principle was that a state exigency, state interest, is superior to those rules of morality which controls individuals. Now that was not an expedient, an excuse, seized upon to justify the beginning of the war; it is fundamental. The theory of the modern republic is that right begins with the individual. It was stated in the Declaration of Independence, that instrument which it was the fashion to sneer at a few years ago, but which states the fundamental principle upon which alone a free republic can live. It was that individual men have inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments are instituted to secure those rights. The ancient theory, the theory of monarchies and alike of the ancient republics upon which they went down to their ruin, was that the state in the beginning was the foundation of right and that individuals derive their rights from the state, and therefore, the exigencies of the state are superior to all individual rights. It was upon the continuance and assertion of that principle that this war in Europe was begun. And upon that principle it was declared that there was no obligation upon a nation to keep the faith of a treaty if it did not suit its interests. It was declared that there was no obligation

upon a nation to observe the rules of that law of nations upon which all civilized states have agreed, *if it did not suit its interest.* Now mark, I am not discussing the right or wrong, I am stating the principle of action which was followed and which was asserted to be right. Upon that principle little Servia was served with an ultimatum that demanded the surrender of her independence; and upon her failure to comply to the uttermost, she was overwhelmed. Upon that principle little Belgium that had no quarrel with anybody was served with a demand that she surrender her independent rights as a neutral and violate her solemn agreements to preserve her neutrality; and upon her refusal to surrender her rights and violate her faith, she was overwhelmed. And that principle is still maintained and asserted to be right. I repeat that I am not referring to this for the purpose of discussing it, I am referring to it because it bears directly upon our business here to-day. It doesn't matter much what you and I think about these things, it doesn't matter that I think they were immoral and criminal, as I do, it doesn't matter that I think that if that principle of national conduct is to be maintained and approved in this world, then liberty and civilization must die. What does matter is that approximately one-half the entire military power of this world supports that proposition. And I say to you, and I wish I could say it to every American, if that principle of national conduct be approved in the struggle that is pending, be approved by the free people of America, be approved by the conscience of the civilized world, *then our American freedom will surely die and die while we live.*

The German note proposing a peace conference used a phrase which aptly describes the concrete application of the principle about which I am talking. It said, "We were forced to take the sword for justice and for *liberty of national evolution.*" Liberty of national evolution! It was national evolution that overran Servia. It was national evolution that crushed Belgium. And national evolution has not confined itself to the pathway to the Channel or to the pathway to the Bosporus; it has extended over Asia and Africa, all over the world, except America, North and South, eager and grasping and resolute, gathering in under its flag under domination, under national control, *the territory of the earth.*

All nations have been at fault during this last half century. Many crimes have been committed, no nations that I know have

been guiltless—none. Neither England, nor France, nor Russia, nor Germany, nor Austria, nor the United States. For we still have to answer for Mexico. But the world is partitioned—Asia, Africa, Australasia, the Islands of the Sea, all taken up—except America. And we stand here with the Monroe Doctrine against the push and sweep of that *mighty world tendency of national evolution* and to its progress under the principle that neither faith of treaties nor obligation of law nor rule of morality should *stand in the way* of a State that finds its interest to *take what it wants* for its national interest. How long will the Monroe Doctrine be worth the paper it was written on in 1823 if that condition is to go on? That Doctrine is that the safety of the United States forbids any foreign military power to obtain a foothold upon this continent from which it may readily make war upon the United States—that is the Monroe Doctrine—it is a declaration of what, in the opinion of the United States, is necessary for the safety of the United States. Now that Doctrine is not international law. It has been maintained by three things. In the first place, the men of Monroe's time never thought of such a thing as not being ready to fight for their rights. They were Belgians, those people. The second has been that the balance of power in Europe has been so even, so close, and everybody has been so doubtful about what the other fellows were going to do, that nobody found it worth while to take on a row with the United States. And third, England's fleet. Now I ask what that Monroe Doctrine will be worth if we aren't ready to protect it? Suppose the result of this war is such that these foreign influences that have helped preserve the Monroe Doctrine disappear, and we aren't ready to defend it? Worthless! What will it mean if a foreign naval power, a real naval power, a real military power, obtains a naval base in the Caribbean, or in those islands of the Pacific off Panama? Our interests in the Panama Canal will be as worthless to us as the Bosporus is to Russia to-day. And instead of having what we have spent four hundred millions to accomplish, the means of transferring our navy from ocean to ocean, our navy will be shut up again on one side or the other of the continent. And then we will have to live as poor, peaceable France has lived for the last forty years, with a sentinel always on the lookout for an approaching foe. Then the fancied security and sweet, comfortable ease of our people will be re-

placed by alarms and rumors of war and attack upon occasion. For the Monroe Doctrine was based upon sound wisdom, and the abandonment of it or the destruction of it will be the end of our security.

It seems to me that we have reached a point now where we can say that a prudent man, a man competent to be a trustee of property, will see that it is necessary for us to prepare to defend our rights. For why should not this principle of national aggression be applied to us? Why shouldn't it be applied to South and Central America and the West Indies? Here we all are, rich, undefended, supine—fair game for anybody who wants national evolution. Can anybody tell why it should not? Interest and principle and habit all will conspire to a treatment of America like the treatment of China. And there is only one way possible for us to defend or be ready to defend our rights, and that is by going back to the old principle of universal preparation for service. We have found, beyond the possibility of question, that volunteering, however ready the people may be, will not answer the purpose, because nobody volunteers until war, and when the war comes it is too late for him to learn to do his duty. Nobody is volunteering now, nobody volunteers for the National Guard or the Regular Army, and nobody will until the war. It is a matter of demonstration that you cannot get together a volunteer force in time of peace so as to prepare them to render their service in time of war.

Now, going back to the matters which should lead a reasonable person to consider that there is *a possibility* of our being attacked, I want to call your attention to the way in which war comes. It doesn't come ordinarily by some country starting out a great fleet and a million men to go and invade another. It comes by a process of gradual aggression. What is going to happen to us if we do not get ready to defend our rights will be that first there will be one little aggression upon our rights—we will submit; there will be another little aggression, going a little farther, upon our rights, and we will submit; there will be another, and another, and another, and finally the patience of this great democracy will be worn out and they will clamor for war, and they will rush into war, unprepared for war. That is what is going to happen if we do not get ready so that it will not be worth while. You can't consider what men are going to do as if they were angels. Men are men, and greed and injustice

and covetousness, and a desire to overrun the rights of others, stalk through the earth to-day as they did two thousand years ago. He who does not defend his liberty is foolish and simple and unworthy of liberty.

Another thing: The President has recently made a speech in the Senate, which we have all been reading, and I wish you to observe that the only way he sees out of the war that is devastating Europe is by preparation for war. There is much noble idealism in that speech of the President. With its purpose I fully sympathize. The kind of peace he describes is the peace that I long for. But the way he sees to preserve that peace is by preparation for war. Now, if some of our friends among the cornfields and the cotton fields and the mines and the citrus fruit orchards, will sit up and read this clause of the President's speech, telling how we may prevent further wars, they may have reason to wonder whether they haven't forgotten something. Here it is: "Mere agreement may not make peace secure. It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged, or any alliance hitherto formed or projected, that no nation, no probable combinations of nations, could face or withstand it. If the peace presently to be made is to endure it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind." Now, I hope that paragraph means what I hope it does. I do not understand it as intended to commit the United States to enter into a convention or treaty with the other civilized countries of the world which will bind the United States to go to war on the continent of Europe or of Asia or in any other part of the world without the people of the United States having an opportunity at the time to say whether they will go to war or not. There would be serious difficulties, I think, insurmountable obstacles to the making of any such agreement. One is, that agreement or no agreement, when the time comes the people of the United States will not go into any war, and nobody can get them into any war, unless they then are in favor of fighting for something. And nothing can be so bad as to make a treaty and then break it. What I understand by it is that a convention shall be made by which all the civilized nations shall agree with all their power to stand behind the maintenance of the peace thus agreed upon, and if that peace be infringed upon then each nation shall determine what it is its duty to do under

the obligation of that agreement towards the maintenance of that peace. But observe that that is worthless, meaningless, unless the nations that enter into it keep the power behind it. It will be worthless agreement on our part if we haven't a ship or a soldier that we can contribute to the war, if war there ought to be, for the maintenance of that peace. And it absolutely requires that we shall build up a force, a potential power of arms, commensurate with our size, our numbers, our wealth, our dignity, our part among the nations of the earth.

There is just one other sentence of this speech about which I wish to say a word, and that is the declaration that the peace must be a peace without victory. Now, I sympathize with that. But the peace that the President describes involves the absolute destruction and abandonment of the principles upon which this war was begun. It doesn't say "Servia," it doesn't say "Belgium," but there the chosen head of the American people has declared the principles of the American democracy in unmistakable terms, has declared for the independence and equal rights of all small and weak nations, has declared for a Monroe Doctrine of the whole world precluding all nations from interfering with the independent control of its own affairs by every small nation, from taking away the territory of other nations, from attempting to exercise the coercion of superior power over other nations, for disarmament, for the reduction of these mighty armies and navies. And every word of that declaration, which I believe truly represents the conscience and judgment of the American people, denounces the sacrifices of Belgium and of Servia and the principles upon which they were made.

Now one side of that is the declaration that peace must be without victory. Suppose that such a peace cannot be made without victory, which is the superior? Which is to obtain? Of course, the great end and the choice of means becomes infinitely subordinate. If that peace, the peace that enthrones in the world principles of individual liberty and national right, and national subjection to the laws of morals can be obtained without any further military pressure, then, thank God for it. But if it cannot be obtained without such further military pressure as to end in victory, then let us pray for the victory.

It is one of the best qualities of human nature that makes us as we enjoy the blessings of freedom of intellect, freedom of religion, freedom of action, to look back with gratitude to the

men who sacrificed themselves in the long struggle of the ages for these things. Whether they be martyrs at the stake, or Cameronians in the Highlands of Scotland, or Huguenots in the Gvennes, or lawyers pleading for justice against popular clamor and disapproval, or brave men fighting in the defense of their country's liberty, we are all grateful to them because our blessings came from their noble sacrifice.

My friends, so sure am I that liberty and security in this land of ours depends upon the destruction and abandonment of the hated principle of national aggrandisement and immorality, and the enthronement of the principles of national responsibility and morality, that for all the countless generations to come after us in our dear land, I am grateful with all my heart to those men who are fighting in the trenches in France and Belgium and Russia and Italy and the Balkans to-day for the liberty and peace of my children's children. (Long applause and cheering.)

CHAIRMAN PARKER: The next session will be held in the D. A. R. Hall at 8:00 o'clock. The session to-morrow morning is in this room at 10:00 o'clock. All in favor of adjourning will say "Aye." Contrary "No." The meeting stands adjourned.

SECOND SESSION

Thursday Evening, January 25, 1917, 9 P. M., D. A. R. Memorial Hall

AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL POSITION

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. William Cumming Story, President-General National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at 8 o'clock P. M.

MRS. WILLIAM CUMMING STORY: I count it a very great privilege to be permitted to speak for the ninety-five thousand Daughters of the American Revolution, the women who have descended directly from the patriots who stood for the things that this great gathering represents.

It is peculiarly appropriate, I think, that this meeting should be held in this Memorial Continental Hall, the only building erected by women as a memorial to the ideals of our country, the standard for which our patriots died. It is most fitting that this great gathering should be held here. It is a great privilege to feel that you have come here in this building for the purpose that has brought you here, and I am glad to say how welcome you are.

I count it also a very great privilege to present a great man who will preside and conduct the meeting this evening. It is my privilege to present Senator Sutherland of Utah, President of the American Bar Association. (Applause.)

ADDRESS

Hon. George Sutherland, United States Senator from Utah and President of the American Bar Association

SENATOR SUTHERLAND: I deeply sympathize with the aims and purposes of this Congress and I esteem it an honor to be called upon to preside over one of its meetings.

The most important question before the American people today is that of preparedness: preparedness in its broader sense,

military, economic and industrial, a preparedness which will not only enable us to defend ourselves upon land and sea against any enemy, however powerful, but which under all circumstances will render us industrially and financially self-sustaining and independent of all the world. It is a very great mistake for any one to imagine that the issue of military preparedness involves the choice of war, as opposed to peace. Between the blessings of peace and the misfortune of war, there can, of course, be but one choice, but to imagine that peace is something that somehow takes care of itself is one of those fatal illusions which constitute the greatest menace to peace. (Applause.) And it is moreover a fallacy which is confounded by every community that maintains a police force to compel the peace.

I hate war and I love peace with all my soul, only I want it to be the peace of courage and honor and self respect. (Applause.) And not the peace of cowardice or craven surrender. (Applause.)

It is a fact, a melancholy fact, no doubt, but a fact, nevertheless, that in the intercourse of nations, a battleship is generally more potent than a soft answer to turn away wrath (laughter) and, therefore, the best guarantee which a just nation can have —and surely this is a just nation—is to be thoroughly prepared for war. (Applause.)

The emblem of peace is the dove, a sweet and lovely but a timid creature, whose longing to be let alone no hawk has ever respected. (Laughter.) The eagle is the king of birds, the personification of strength and courage; he has some unlovely traits of character to be sure, but unpreparedness is not among them. (Laughter and applause.) Its strong beak and sharp talons inspire the most piratical of hawks with a feeling of wholesome respect.

The dove falls a victim, a helpless victim to rapacity. The eagle is immune, not because of their different sentiments on the subject of peace, but because one is weak and the other is strong.

For more than a generation, for more than a century, the self-reliant figure of the eagle has symbolized the spirit of America to yield nothing to an aggressor, but in these later times—perhaps, I may say without offense, especially during the strenuous days of the recent campaign—I have fancied that there was be-

coming manifest on the part of a good many people of this country a disposition to recall the eagle and substitute the dove as the National emblem (laughter and applause) in token of the new dispensation which teaches that nothing matters so long as the door of retreat is left open. (Laughter.)

Of course we may go along for a good many years without being attacked by any other nation, even though we do not prepare to protect ourselves, or defend ourselves. But he has read history to little purpose who does not know that sooner or later we shall have enemies in the future as we have had enemies in the past, and in that event a peace-loving people can never be quite sure of being able to realize their desires unless they are a peace-compelling people as well. (Applause.)

I do not know which is the more detestable—an individual who seeks a fight because he is a bully, or an individual who avoids a fight because he is a coward. To my mind the most admirable of all men is he who keeps the peace toward others, because he is just, and compels the peace toward himself because he is strong and resolute. (Applause.)

I would apply to a nation the test that I apply to a man. The nation, like an individual, must carefully distinguish between the desire for peace which springs from a timid soul, anxious only to be safe, and that which comes from a stout heart seeking the way of righteousness.

If our people are entitled to have their lives protected in Mexico and elsewhere, as I for one think they are (loud applause) we must not only assert the right, but we must be prepared to defend it. (Applause.) We must not only promise to hold those to strict accountability who violate the right, but we must be prepared to redeem the promise if it becomes necessary. (Applause.)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is no part of the business of the chairman to make a speech. It is his business to preside and let others do the talking. As I understand the topic this evening it is that of America's International Position, and the first address to be delivered under that general title is "America's International Relations." I know of no one who can speak with greater authority upon that subject than William Roscoe Thayer of Harvard University, whom it is my great pleasure now to present. (Applause.)

AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

William Roscoe Thayer, Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass.

Emerson concludes his essay on "Illusions" by a noble passage in which he describes how a youth, entering upon life, his soul fired by ideals, sees the gods in the firmament, every god sitting in his sphere. "The young mortal enters the hall of the firmament; there is he alone with them alone, they pouring on him benedictions and gifts, and beckoning him up to their thrones. On the instant, and incessantly, fall snow-storms of illusions. He fancies himself in a vast crowd which sways this way and that, and whose movement and doings he must obey; he fancies himself poor, orphaned, insignificant. The mad crowd drives him hither and thither, now furiously commanding this thing to be done, now that. What is he that he should resist their will, and think or act for himself! Every moment new changes and new showers of deceptions to baffle and distract him. And when, by and by, for an instant, the air clears and the clouds lift a little, there are the gods still sitting around him on their thrones—alone with him alone."

During the calamity of this atrocious war how many of us, like the youth, have been blinded by a storm of doubts and of horrors! We had lived so long in a world where we took it for granted that every person in Christendom agreed with every other in holding a few principles of honor, humanity and justice, that we were amazed when Germany announced that its standard was the standard of Attila, that Moloch was its god and Frightfulness its method. Many souls anxiously asked themselves whether this new invasion of the Huns might not result in the destruction of our civilization, which we have drawn from the best of Judea, and Greece, from Rome, Italy, France, Holland and England, and from those earlier Germans, who, like Goethe, repudiated the barbarian instincts of the Prussians. Progress does not advance at a uniform rate. Nations and systems go out, and nothing replaces them. Just as the highly cultivated Saracens went down before the crude and ruthless Spaniards, might it not be that our civilized nations must succumb before the new Barbarians, masters of every material device for waging war? Would another Dark Age, such as that which prevailed in Europe from the fourth century to the

twelfth, overshadow the world? What has happened once, may happen again.

Even as we whisper this doubt, we see through the battle smoke which palls the firmament a rift, and there sit the great gods as of old from everlasting. There are Justice, Honor and Mercy; and there is the Avenger, who exacts retribution in strange and terrible ways. Their august faces look pityingly upon us, that we should have so little trust in spiritual reality as to believe that they could be destroyed by any material agency or by any change in geographical frontiers.

This is a moral world. Autocrats may tear up the scrap of paper on which the moral law is written; the paper goes, but the law remains unscathed. So, when I seek a cornerstone on which our international relations should rest, I find nothing more solid, nothing more durable than this—"Righteousness exalteth a nation." Never in history has it been as necessary as it is now to repeat and still to repeat this truth; for never before have the American people been seduced to believe that righteousness does not matter, that comfort and money-making, luxury and the means to evade moral obligations, are the proofs of national prosperity. For nations, as for men, the moral consideration—character—is fundamental. Woe unto the leaders of a people who beguile them into preferring any material or any other gain to this.

In what I have to say, I assume this to be essential, for I cannot conceive that the United States will long count in international diplomacy, unless they recover the moral prestige which politicians have frittered away through cowardice, selfseeking or incompetence. Numbers will avail us nothing. The larger the herd of sheep, the happier the pack of wolves. With an army of 3200 men, of whom only 1100 were Europeans, Clive defeated 68,000 native Bengalese at Plassy—Plassy, that stupendous battle which gave England the Indian Empire. So Japan standing relatively as one to ten with China, smote China helpless. Age after age, history shows similar examples of the destruction of populous, enervated nations, by the few sturdy and strong.

Wealth will not help us! On the contrary, every additional dollar is an added incentive for the rapacity of predatory powers. Wealth is timid. Wealth has a dulled sense of honor. Wealth, like the goose that laid the golden egg, asks only to be left un-

disturbed on her nest. But the world is full of gunners eager for that kind of game. What was once a matter of lifting cattle, or a border foray, has now become the chief business of nations which proclaim themselves the final embodiment of human superiority. They lay their plans forty years ahead. They establish a religion to sanctify their project. They bend science and invention, industry and education to make everything ready. They rename their ancient trade of highwaymen "patriotism." None but a fool can suppose that they will covet our wealth the less because it is enormous, or respect it the more because it is unprotected.

Others here will speak for military and naval preparation; I urge a need that precedes that—the need of national moral regeneration. Until we recover our national self-respect, until we realize that as Americans we have many sacred ideals which it is our duty to fight for and to die for, we shall never rank again among the great nations of the world. I make no specious claim to neutrality. Only a moral eunuch could be neutral in the sense implied by the malefic dictum of the President of the United States. I deny that there is no distinction between the ravisher and his victim; between Germany, brutalized by the creed of Moloch, and France heroically defending herself against the Teuton monster. I deny that a conflict in which civilization is at stake does not concern Americans. If Freedom, if Pity, if Humanity do not concern us, what does? Perhaps some future apologist will try to excuse these and similar doctrines, which comprise the Wilson Negations, on the ground that Mr. Wilson was misunderstood. I simply state the fact, without comment, that his words did more than any other single cause to change American public opinion.

It is largely because of these Wilsonian Negations of our fundamental beliefs that we are met in this Congress; for these negations have sifted like a subtle poison into the hearts of our countrymen—distorting the vision in some, destroying in others the power to distinguish between good and evil, causing many to look unmoved on unspeakable cruelties, and creating in most an ignoble desire not to be interrupted in their money-making and their pleasures.

The first step we must take in every field we have marked out for our work, will be to abolish the evil growths which have sprung up from such seeds. We must repair the corroded moral

fibre of the nation; we must restore patriotism; we must quicken our sense of moral obligation towards all the world; we must put an end forever to the damning implication that American men are the only men on earth from whom manliness is neither expected nor required.

I pass to more specific concerns.

First, there is what I may call the technique of diplomacy. This can be executed only by trained experts—yet trained experts are almost as rare as nightingales in the State Department. Perhaps it is unavoidable that we should elect our presidents without reference to their qualification in international affairs; but there has grown up the indefensible custom by which the President appoints as Secretary of State his chief competitor for the nomination. He might with equal sense appoint the man from whom he had just won a golf match, or the first red-haired stranger he met on Pennsylvania Avenue. To describe such a custom is to condemn it. Nor need I cite here the humiliations which it has recently brought upon us.

Another requisite for the proper conduct of diplomacy is reticence, reserve. Instead of this, garrulousness is the fashion. Notes bulging with literary style are indited and hurried to the press, almost before the persons to whom they were addressed can have received them. The public talks for a day or two about the writer's skill in trolling phrases, in balancing clause with clause, in interspersing runs and cadences, in sending out venerable platitudes decked with new ribbon. But nothing happens, and after a while there follows another note, which may serve like its predecessor as a model to students of English composition.

This is a dangerous breach of diplomatic technique. If you are conducting an important business transaction, you do not rush into print about it before it is concluded. Directors do not choose a man to be president of a great corporation because he excels as an essayist. The great traditions of our diplomacy do not countenance this. The mightiest diplomatic message ever sent by an American took less than two lines. Here they are, as written on September 5, 1863, by Charles Francis Adams, our Minister in London, to Lord John Russell, the British Foreign Secretary: "It would be superfluous in me to point out to your Lordship that this is war." Earl Russell understood. He and Adams both knew the language which men use when they mean what they say and are not merely writing notes.

It is time that the State Department and the White House returned to practice diplomacy according to our great traditions.

Coming next to the substance of our foreign relations, we all recognize that the Atrocious War has taught everybody, what has been evident to a few for some time past, that isolation no longer exists for us. In December, 1895, when President Cleveland sent his brusque message to England on the Venezuela Boundary, we literally broke into the arena of world politics. We then advanced into the Pacific by annexing the Hawaiian Islands; and became involved in the Asiatic tangle by taking the Philippines. We planted ourselves in the West Indies at Puerto Rico, and when we built the Panama Canal, we made ourselves, willy-nilly, warders of the American hemisphere.

I am not discussing the wisdom of these moves; nor of the Monroe Doctrine which, since Napoleon III's forced withdrawal from Mexico in 1867, had played little part in the popular imagination until Cleveland's Venezuela Message. Then the Doctrine took on a new edge, and European Powers rightly regarded it as a challenge, if not as a menace. Few of them probably dreamed of establishing new dominions on this side of the Atlantic, but the mere fact of a prohibition which curtails the future acts is a grievance. One Power, however, was just beginning to intoxicate itself with visions of a transoceanic empire. Germany saw in Brazil the richest region in the world still unexploited by any of the great countries. Brazil could house the entire population of the Fatherland, and still have room for more. But the Monroe Doctrine declared that Germany should not control Brazil. During several years, Emperor William II strove, by secret intrigue or by open deeds, to discover whether the United States would defend the Doctrine, and finally, when in 1902 President Roosevelt informed him that he must consent within 48 hours to arbitrate the Venezuela difficulty or run the risk of war, the Kaiser understood that that American Administration at least was in earnest. He arbitrated.

Thus the Monroe Doctrine—which binds us to prevent foreign Powers from establishing a new dominion in either America—and our own acquisition of territory overseas, have destroyed our isolation—that fact on which much of our earlier policy was based. And now invention, which makes it possible for a European enemy to attack us by submarines or by aircraft, de-

prives us also of the isolation which geographical remoteness gave.

Before we can pursue a consistent and continuous foreign policy, therefore, we shall need to decide whether to cling to the Monroe Doctrine, or to let it lapse. How can we enter into any European or Asiatic combination which would entitle us to meddle in the affairs of Europe or Asia, so long as we refuse to allow foreign nations to interfere, even in matters which chiefly concern themselves, with any American country? Reciprocity is so obviously the principle which should govern civilized intercourse, that we cannot go on claiming universal privileges and conceding none. When the war ends we shall be an almost defenseless nation in a world every one of whose able-bodied men is a soldier—a world little inclined to respect a people who wince at the thought of suffering or sacrifice. It may be then that one foreign nation, or several, may infringe on our Monroe Doctrine and may say, if we remonstrate: "Well, what are you going to do about it?" What should we reply? What could we do about it? No foreign policy is stronger than the physical force it can command to back it up, in case it is put to the test of war.

Thanks to the European complications during the past twenty years—thanks also to the protection of the British Fleet—we could flaunt our defiance with slight danger of being called to defend it; but, as there is little likelihood that this immunity will serve us much longer, we must determine, with all the soberness, foresight and judgment we possess, how much, if any, of the Monroe Doctrine we will stand by.

Interlocked with this, is the question of our joining in any league to enforce peace after the present war—a project which, however we may sympathize with it, presents many diplomatic difficulties. There is also the further disadvantage, so far as we are concerned, that at present our ability to enforce anything is so puny, that we should be the laughing-stock in any league the other members of which would have from ten to fifty times our quota. Switzerland to-day can mobilize half a million men; while the United States has not fifty thousand of similar quality.

A third matter is involved in the settlement of these two—a tradition older than the Monroe Doctrine, and, owing to its venerable origin, not lightly to be abandoned. In his Farewell Address, written in 1796, Washington warned his countrymen:

" 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world." For 120 years this warning has been the guiding principle of our statesmen, irrespective of party; and yet as Mr. Beck has recently urged with characteristic clearness, the time has come when we must consider whether our foreign policy ought longer to be bound by it.

A maxim which, having outlived the conditions to which it originally applied, if preserved as a fetish may do much harm; for the effort to perpetuate the obsolete phrases and ideas of creeds and constitutions blocks the spread of living truth; and unless truth be alive, what is it? Now anyone who reads Washington's Farewell Address attentively must perceive that it consists of certain broad restatements of the eighteenth century political wisdom and of certain specific recommendations. He introduces his advice in regard to "permanent alliances," for instance, by the questions: "Why forego the advantage of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground?" When we inquire what he meant by the "peculiar situation" which was so advantageous to us, we find, of course, that he meant our isolation. It took from four to six weeks then for a ship to cross the Atlantic. Even in Europe the communications were so slow, and so often interrupted, that it required the better part of a month for news to pass between London and Vienna or Berlin and Madrid. How difficult, therefore, must it have been for the United States to follow the shifting combinations of war or diplomacy from so great a distance!

Washington had also another reason for bidding his countrymen not to entangle themselves in the European quarrels. He knew that the great task for the young American republic was to develop freely according to its own nature—to become thoroughly American and thoroughly Republican, unvitiated by foreign interests or examples.

To-day the argument against permanent alliances, so far as it is based on geographical isolation, has disappeared. We could not isolate ourselves if we tried. The second argument has likewise so changed as to be no longer valid. We do not need to go abroad, to run the risk of being vitiated by contact with foreigners and their ideals; for we have adopted nearly twenty-five million foreigners since 1860. Accordingly, the problem is already internal, and not merely external.

I do not believe, therefore, that, if Washington were alive, he

would continue to insist on our observing his warning against alliances. Like other consummate statesmen he was an opportunist. He held certain moral doctrines from which nothing could swerve him; he cherished ideals which he always strove to realize; but in dealing with each present fact, he was a stern realist, unbefogged by theory and unscared by custom. And just as he would never have prepared an outfit of pontoon bridges to cross a river dry enough to be forded, so he would not now ground the international policy of the United States on an isolation which does not exist.

While it seems likely that further appeal to Washington's judgment in this matter may soon cease, his warning against the concrete dangers of a foreign alliance cannot grow out of date. These dangers should be kept in mind always, and should be emphasized whenever it is proposed to incur them, because whenever we wish strongly to do a thing, we exaggerate the expected benefits, and minimize the risk.

A historian who indulges in prophesy deserves the fate of a fish out of water. Recall what the prophets were glibly saying, and half the world was believing, less than three years ago. There would never be a great war because (1) the engines of destruction had become so terrible that no troops would stand up before them; and because (2) commerce had bound the nations together, and identified their interests; because (3) there would not be money enough to finance a war on the modern scale; because (4) the Socialists and proletarians everywhere, members of a world-wide international brotherhood, would refuse to fight against their fellows; because (5) no government or monarch could be so wicked or insane as to plunge mankind into the most horrible catastrophe in order to gratify personal or dynastic pride.

So argued the prophets; yet within three months the war which they had proved impossible, had burst upon the world. After thirty months, this war is raging still. Such an example should put prophecy out of fashion for half a century. I, at least, will predict nothing definite as to what will happen at its close.

But as it is clear, even now, that international readjustments on a world scale will be called for, so we may outline what might well be the general policy of the United States in the new system. For in spite of Washington, we shall be more inextricably entangled than ever.

Twenty years ago Secretary John Hay said that by holding fast to the cardinal principles of the Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule, American diplomacy could hardly go far wrong. To-day, as I have remarked, the stability of the Monroe Doctrine is in doubt, and the Golden Rule was abrogated when our Government uttered no protest against the ravishing of Belgium. Whether the Monroe Doctrine stay or go, the restoration of the Golden Rule should be the first object of our Executive Department; because that describes the spirit in which all our diplomacy—nay, all our relations with the world—should be conducted. "In my experience of diplomatic life," John Hay said further—he was speaking in 1901—"which now covers more years than I like to look back upon, and in the far greater record of American diplomacy which I have read and studied, I can say without hesitation that we have generally told squarely what we wanted, announced early in negotiation what we were willing to give, and allowed the other side to accept or reject our terms." Let us restore this simple, straightforward spirit to our diplomacy; let us stand again honored among the nations.

There are two matters on which the United States ought henceforth to exert a great influence; these are War and Democracy.

When the present struggle ends, there should be a more serious effort than has ever been made before to conclude with the Great Powers of the world some league or agreement to prevent future wars. Militarism must be banned, as head-hunting—its primitive manifestation—was long ago banned. We must smite the old falsehood that human nature is always the same; on which is based the fallacy that war always has been and always will be. Most of the gains which have raised man above his original brute state, have been made in spite of, and often forcibly against, nature. Cannibalism was once common and quite in the way of nature; it is still practised by savages; but nobody urges this as a reason why we should be cannibals. So too of slavery. The historic fact is that the monarchs—who are the instigators of most of the wars—have always encouraged the idea that war is inevitable. If they worked as zealously for peace, can we suppose that peace would not ensue? Latterly we have heard that war is a biological necessity. This fallacy also, based on a misinterpretation of the phrase "survival of the fittest," has been exploded. Nearly 200 years ago Cardinal Fleury, the astute minister of Louis XV, remarked to an enthusiast who

had written a book to show how future wars could be prevented: "You have forgotten, Sir, as a preliminary article, to commence by sending a troop of missionaries to incline the heart and mind of the princes."

It will devolve upon the United States, which have no Hohenzollern, or Hapsburg, or Romanoff or other dynastic ambition to serve by promoting war, to lead the nations of the world to recognize that peace, not war, should be civilized man's normal condition; and this we can never do by reiterating the catchwords of peace-at-any-price fanatics.

Finally, the United States must stand among the Powers as the exponent of Democracy. Our diplomacy must be democratic. We must cease to have an apologetic, or by-your-leave manner in our international conferences—a manner which is not less offensive than that of the spread-eagles who sometimes fill the halls of Congress with their screams. The representatives of Autocracy never apologize; they never beg pardon for urging their claims; as Adams remarked, they never indulge in "superfluous courtesy," nor take care to hide their belief that those with whom they are dealing are inferior beings. Let our diplomacy body forth, without bluster or evasion, its democratic essence.

One who has had the vision of Democracy knows only too well that this ideal has never been realized, even afar off, in any actual democracy; but he knows that in this vision lies the hope of the human race. Despotism, the virtual ownership of the many by one or by a few, has existed since the days of the cavemen. Strip it of its modern trappings and subterfuges, which serve to disguise its real nature, and it is still in many respects pursuing the aims of the cavemen. But just as it required many ages before the revelation came in religion that each human being has an inviolable soul through which to apprehend the Infinite, so in civil and political life the conception developed slowly that each individual has rights which no despot, call him Kaiser or call him "the State," as you please—should infringe. Then the conviction sank in that under Liberty alone can man attain his highest scope. As he is a moral agent, so he must be free to choose and to act; under Despotism, both his choice and his acts are compulsory.

And so Democracy arose as the ideal system. Merely by being, it became the irreconcilable antagonist of Despotism;

every inch it gained, meant so much shorn from the despot's absolutism. During the nineteenth century, Democracy's advance seemed so irresistible, that we came to assume that it could not be checked, and we further assumed that its doctrines were so self-evident that anyone who understood them would embrace them. In truth, however, ever since the fall of the Bastile in 1789, autocrats and the privileged classes on which they depend, have been slowly assembling their forces in order to crush democracy. That is the motive at the heart of the present war.

With the world thus aligned—the forces of Democracy on one side, the forces of Despotism on the other—an alignment which seems likely to stand for years, the general international policy of the United States is clear. In every combination into which the question of Despotism enters as an integral and essential part, we must uphold the side of Democracy. To do less than this would be to deny our faith.

Cases may arise in which we join with despotic countries to achieve a common purpose, but that purpose must be liberal, not despotic. Thus at the time of the Revolution we accepted the help and alliance of the despotic King of France—and to that alliance we owe more than we can ever repay. Thus too, in 1859, Cavour did not hesitate to procure the assistance of the despot Napoleon III, in order to free Italy. Such examples show how our policy should turn.

And so I repeat that, henceforth the United States must exert a greater influence than ever for Democracy. This supreme inheritance has come to us through no merits of our own. How many ages Destiny waited! Not to Greece or Rome, not to Imperial Spain, not Renaissance Italy or France, not to Germany or to Russia did the Fates entrust this last, best gift; but they poured into the hearts of Washington and Adams, of Jefferson and Hamilton and Franklin an understanding of Democracy, and confided to them the founding of this Republic. And later, Destiny embodied Democracy in Abraham Lincoln.

In the long run alliances like friendships should be based on affinity. We should cleave to those whose traditions, whose ideals, whose standards of civilization are closest to ours. "By God! blood is thicker than water!" exclaimed the American Commander Tatnall, nearly sixty years ago, when he saw British men-of-war being hammered by the Chinese Forts; and he opened fire on the Forts. Thirty years later, when the prepos-

terous German Admiral Diederichs threatened to attack Commander Dewey at Manila, it was the British Commander Chichester who assured Dewey that he would stand by him. And at that very time, when Germany was secretly urging England to join a coalition to prevent the American fleet from operating against Spain, England replied that her fleet would be found between any coalition fleet and the American. Blood is thicker than water! Let that be remembered by the shapers of our future policy.

This is our inheritance; this is our trust. Unless we are the backsliders we have lately seemed to the world, we must renew our faith in Democracy. We must be Democratic through and through at home—at home, where the most insidious anti-Democratic enemies are at work—in order to represent Democracy in the eyes of all mankind. The Great Experiment has reached its crisis. Democracy, unorganized and undisciplined, is assailed by the elaborately prepared array of Despotism. Woe unto us if through our defection Democracy perish.

CHAIRMAN SUTHERLAND: It is next my pleasure to introduce to you former Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, who was a great Secretary of War and who is a great American. (Applause.) He will speak to us and give us some reflections upon our military experiment of 1916. (Laughter and Applause.)

SOME REFLECTIONS UPON OUR MILITARY EXPERIMENTS OF 1916

Henry L. Stimson of New York, former Secretary of War

When the National Security League was meeting in Washington a year ago, this country was on the brink of an experiment in military policy. There was being formulated in the National Congress legislation which was to attempt to create out of the militia of the several states a national citizen army. Warnings were being uttered against such an experiment. The then Secretary of War, Mr. Garrison, supported by many students of military policy, was pointing out the impossibility of raising and disciplining an army, the command of which was divided between the central and the local governments. Their warnings were unheeded. The local forces

were too strong. Their power was enhanced by the fact that behind the Militia plan lay a proposition for Militia pay. Furthermore, the voices heard at Washington were mainly those of the higher officers of the National Guard, whose natural prepossessions regarding the organizations which they themselves commanded, made it difficult, if not impossible, for them to exercise impartial judgment. The enlisted men and junior officers had no such voice and it is very doubtful whether the militia proposition represented fairly even the views of the rank and file of the militia itself. For example, I quote from the Gazette issued by the men of the 7th Regiment of New York:

> "We of the Seventh felt that the Militia Pay Bill and that the federalization scheme were grave mistakes. The rank and file of the National Guard throughout the country had no voice in the matter. A few state officers of high rank, influential at Washington, turned the trick and before the bill became a law, the Guard became victims of its provisions as a result of the unexpected mobilization."

The plan went through. Congress yielded to the representations which were supposed to come from the militia but which in fact were not authorized by the great body of them; the President yielded his previously expressed views to Congress; and Mr. Garrison felt constrained to retire from office. Congress adopted as the corner-stone of our national defense a system which violated every canon of military efficiency and which was shown by our own military history to be a foredoomed failure.

Under normal circumstances, such a governmental mistake might have gone unrecognized by the people of the country until in some great war crisis it brought disaster upon the nation. The National Defense Act has within it the seeds of a political machine. It places the militiaman upon the regular pay-roll of the Federal Treasury. He receives pay not connected with outdoor service or with the performance of specific military duty. Ultimately the Act proposes to place in the district of each Congressman 800 such recipients of Federal pay. In normal times, it is highly unlikely that the military defects of such a system would be severely scrutinized by Congress.

During some of the events of the past three years, I had begun to question whether Providence still exercised its traditional care over children, drunkards and the United States. The timely coming of the militia mobilization last summer, however, fifteen days after the National Defense Act became a law, would indicate that in some respects, at least, these doubts were unjustified.

This mobilization has forced down our throats dramatic proof of the shortcomings of our new system. More important than that, it has brought home to the militia the unfairness and injustice of the system to them. The figures showing the results of this mobilization, not only as a military performance, but also in respect to the economic effects upon the Guardsmen and their families, are now becoming available. Such figures have been compiled by the War Department and laid before the committees of Congress by the Chief of Staff. Further figures have been compiled by private authorities, notably the committee appointed by the Mayor of the City of New York. They are worthy of the careful study of every citizen.

In order to get the background against which to view these figures, it is necessary to remember that the first proposition of our land defense is to provide a force of at least 500,000 men ready to meet an invasion. Recent estimates of the General Staff have placed the size of the required force at even higher figures than 500,000, but for our present purpose, we will take the minimum discussed at the time when this legislation was under consideration. This force must be composed mainly of trained citizens. The Regular Army cannot be made its basis. The main function of the Regular Army is a different one, namely, to furnish the garrisons of our national outposts and insular possessions, as well as the higher officers for our citizen soldiery. There are less than 50,000 mobile regulars within the United States to-day and we are finding it extremely difficult to recruit this force into larger proportions with even the assistance of a much higher rate of pay than is received by almost any other army.

Furthermore, studies of the General Staff, based upon the strength of the armies and the merchant marines of other nations have shown that it would take but little over two weeks for any one of at least three nations to land upon our Atlantic seaboard

an expeditionary force of over 150,000 men (in one case more than double that number) with their accompanying animals and equipment. The same studies show that a force of nearly 100,000 men could be similarly landed by at least one nation of the Orient in barely three weeks upon our western seaboard. Two of these four nations are to-day certainly and the other two possibly superior to the United States in naval power and might be able to control the sea within a brief interval after the outbreak of war. The problem, therefore, of meeting an invading force is a real and not an academic problem. What have we got under our new system with which to meet such an invasion as shown by the practical test which we went through last summer?

In the first place it is erroneous to say that this test was not a fair test, because the system had only just gone into effect, and that had the law been in existence longer the results would have been different. The Militia system is not a new system. For over fifteen years, the National Guard have been receiving from the federal government constantly increasing appropriations for arms, ammunition, uniforms, travel and maneuver pay, for target practice and for various other purposes. Experienced officers of the Regular Army, as advisers and inspectors, have been doing all that men can do to raise the standards of discipline and efficiency in a force over which they have no direct control. The new law added substantially little in the way of improvement to what had been in effect for these fifteen years. It did add the inducement of Federal pay but in the case of the enlisted private this pay amounts to roughly one dollar per week or fifty dollars per year, and however effective that might be to stimulate the interest of politicians in the system in time of peace, it is unlikely that such an amount of money would produce many more fighting volunteers in time of war. I think, therefore, it is not unfair to say that the results of the mobilization would have been substantially the same whether it occurred in 1916 or five years later.

The President's call issued on June 18, was for units at war strength. Take the situation on August 31st, when numbers were at their maximum and there had been nearly two and one-half months in which to recruit. The war strength of the units called for should have been 252,000 men. As a matter of fact,

we were able to raise only 138,500 men. We were 113,500 men short. This was in spite of the most zealous efforts at recruiting; it was on top of a year of unparalleled interest in military affairs, when hundreds of thousands of citizens all over the United States were marching in parades and shouting themselves hoarse for preparedness.

Nor were these men whom we did raise, trained Guardsmen. Over 60 per cent. of them were wholly raw recruits who had come in since the call. Nearly 50 per cent. of the enlisted Guardsmen, whose names were originally on the rolls of the militia units included in the call, disappeared altogether after the call came. Over 23,000 of these were found physically unfit. Over 7,000 wholly failed to answer the call; and over 16,000 (nearly enough to constitute an infantry division) disappeared between the time of the call and the muster in, nobody knows where.

In the case of two states, Georgia and Kentucky, such loose methods of medical examination had been employed by the state authorities that upon the call last summer more than half of their Guardsmen were rejected by the Federal examiners as physically unfit for service. In the case of one company of the First Kentucky Infantry, these rejections amounted to 77 per cent.

Again, how did the men finally obtained, measure up in the great essentials of discipline and marksmanship? The results of the field inspection of about 123,000 of the force thus mobilized give startling figures. Over 56,000 had never had range instruction with the military rifle before the call; only 19,000 had achieved a standard of marksmanship which the Chief of Staff of the United States Army calls "barely tolerable"; 71,000 of these men had never attended a previous encampment or had any period of field training whatever; only 37 per cent. were men who had received before the call more than three months of our imperfect indoor militia training.

In other words, when the test of service came to this force of the militia of the several states which Congress had planned to make our first line of citizen defense, practically half of it melted away into nothing at the call. When, after three months' strenuous effort at recruiting, we had gathered in all of the men we could lay our hands on, we had a force which was

113,000 or 45 per cent. short of the number called for and only 21 per cent. of whom could shoot "barely tolerably," and 63 per cent. of whom were virtually untrained.

China could hardly have done worse than this. This difference between what the law contemplated and what the actual facts presented, could have hardly been exceeded in the most corrupt bureaucracy. As a matter of fact it is not the result of corruption any more than it is the result of accident.

These facts are not given now for the purpose of causing humiliation to a force of men for whom individually we ought to have the greatest respect and to whom, for their efforts last summer, we owe a debt of national gratitude. They are the result of false theory and a wrong system. They come in the first place, from the system of divided military control. They come, in the second place, from the false theory that this nation can take a body of state militia who have enlisted for one purpose and, by act of Congress, transform it into a body of national soldiery intended for an entirely different purpose. Finally, they come from the most false theory of all—the theory that is the vice of the volunteer system—namely, that you can successfully ask a small number of men, without regard to age, business or any other obligation except that of patriotism, to bear the burden which should rest equally upon the shoulders of us all.

Our failure last summer is not the fault of these Militiamen who for years and under great discouragement have been doing their best in this Nation to keep alive the flame of patriotic duty and military efficiency. The fault rests upon the Nation which, throughout that time, has been entirely indifferent to that duty, and which now, when the call for defense can no longer be resisted, instead of facing manfully a great emergency, has attempted to shuffle off on to the backs of this small body of patriotic men the load which should be borne by all.

The attempt is as shortsighted and futile as it is selfish. The figures of last summer's mobilization make it only too clear what the result will inevitably be. In a free country, no fraction of the population will long continue to bear the burden of the expense properly chargeable against the whole. The records compiled by the Mayor's Committee of New York give an eloquent picture of the hardship imposed by last summer's duty

upon the members of the National Guard and they also picture the inevitable result. 84 per cent. of the Guardsmen, of whom inquiry was made and answered, stated flatly that, after their present term expires, they would not re-enlist in the Guard. The same assertion is made by the 7th Regiment Gazette, as follows:

> "There is no question but that if the present legislation stands as it is to-day, it will only take four years before the National Guard will be so reduced in numbers that it will be disbanded. This is a broad and sweeping statement but the only conclusion that can be drawn from the facts. Almost without exception, every man in the Guard to-day when his period of enlistment is up is through for all time. This is true in all classes of organizations and in all states. * * * At the present time, when the Guard is mustered out (of the Federal service) its members will not only not ask their friends to join, to meet the ever present necessity of recruiting, but they will persuade them not to, and practically none will re-enlist themselves."

We thus reach the next question of what we are going to do about it. It is a pressing question. Too much time has been lost already. At the outbreak of the great European War, other neutral nations lost not a day in putting their military establishments in order. We delayed for nearly two years and then adopted a system which has immediately broken down. The Mexican mobilization has cost us to date between one hundred and ninety and two hundred millions of dollars but that expense can be made in part productive if we immediately avail ourselves of the lesson which it has taught us in order to build up a proper system of defense. If, on the other hand, we do nothing, it will be worse than wasted. Furthermore, the country is now alive to the necessity of preparedness. This is shown by the cheerfulness with which the unprecedented size of the appropriations for military and naval defense, made at the last session of Congress, have been accepted by the country, as well as by the active discussion which this subject has received throughout the land. In a democracy, intelligent and constructive military legislation can probably only be accomplished at such a time. If the period be allowed to pass by

unavailed of, the condition is likely to go on unremedied until the next war crisis, possibly not far distant, finds us wholly unprepared. Under these circumstances, the duty is imposed upon the administration and the Congress which was elected in November to do, without delay, what evidently can be done now but which later may not be possible of accomplishment.

In discussing briefly the course which our policy should follow, it would seem that certain errors of the past have been so clearly revealed by our recent experience that they will hardly be repeated. We shall hardly again make the mistake of trying to create an army under divided authority. Nor are we likely again to think that we can seize upon a body of men who have enlisted for the primary purpose of local home defense, many of them of mature age and with family and business ties, and convert it into an expeditionary force ready to go at a moment's notice to any portion of our broad land. I think that no candid mind can now resist the proof that has been furnished that our new army must be organized, trained and commanded by the central government and that its soldiers must be composed of men, who, owing to their youth, will not only be most fitted for a soldier's life, but also most economically spared from the productive work of the nation.

There remains, however, the fundamental question of how such a force is to be constituted. This question is complicated by many difficulties—difficulties arising not only out of our national history and prejudices but from the suddenness with which, in modern times, the entire mode of warfare has been transformed. In general, there are three possible alternatives, each of which has advocates of merit and respectability.

1st. By voluntary training.
2nd. By selective training.
3rd. By universal training.

I am very glad that the National Security League has so clearly and so many times registered its belief that the last of these methods should be adopted. I believe that this decision rests upon sound and unanswerable reasons—reasons so rooted in the fundamental principles of this Republic—that in the end such a course will be found not only right but most expedient.

The volunteer system has become obsolete, not only because modern war has grown to such gigantic dimensions that the

necessary force will not be obtained by volunteering, but even more clearly because with the growth of modern democracy the unfairness and injustice of such a system has become increasingly apparent. The connection between this development of fact and of principle has been direct and inevitable. The old-time army was a small affair—a group of professional champions. The modern army is the armed nation. The growth in the relative size which the army bears to the state has been simultaneous with the growth of interest which the entire people take in the affairs of government, including the army—that is to say, simultaneous with the growth of democracy. Thus the growth of the modern large army does not mean retrogression into militarism. That is why during the past century the adoption of universal training and service has occurred in free republics like Switzerland, France, Argentine and Chile, and in commonwealths like Australia, and free constitutional monarchies like Norway and Sweden. The work of the army has become so intimately identified with the work of the people of the nation that the citizen feels aggrieved to be asked to do it if his fellow citizen remains idle.

The logic of facts is equally cogent with the logic of reason. Conservative Britain which clung to the volunteer system until face to face with a mortal emergency has now abandoned it. If it failed her, in a country where, proportionately, five young Englishmen in time of peace enlisted in her Territorial Forces as against one young American in our National Guard, what could we hope for from it here? In Canada, also, where in time of peace, six young Canadians enlisted, proportionately, in her National Guard to one young American in ours, and where under pressure of war Canadian patriotism has produced unparalleled results in volunteering, nevertheless the paramount question to-day is whether they shall not introduce the system of compulsion to remedy the injustice made evident by the abstention of certain races and certain provinces.

In other words, this steady trend on the part of the nations of the earth towards popular government on the one hand and universal military training and service on the other, represents but the steady growth of an ideal in justice and fair play, namely that he who has a voice in the selection of his own government is bound in honor to defend that government. It

means further that in spite of past prejudices the peoples of the earth to-day recognize that there is a great difference between compulsion to serve a sovereign and compulsion to serve a commonwealth; that in the latter case, compulsory service means merely the deliberate voluntary choice of the people themselves.

When we come to the further question of the choice between selective training, on the one hand, and universal training on the other, I believe that considerations both of national and of military policy point overwhelmingly to the latter method. The method of selective training—training only a small portion of the young men of the country, chosen by lot—leaves out of consideration, first, the well known historical fact that it is impossible to forecast now the extent of future exigencies in unknown wars. In the second place, it fails to utilize the influence in prevention of war which comes from the fact that a nation has made itself ready to exercise its entire power. Finally it leaves out of consideration all benefit to the citizenship at large. I have come to believe that however important military training may be from the standpoint of national military defense, it is even more important from that of the moral and economic benefit which would be derived by the youth of this nation. In my opinion, the young man of America needs the benefit of military training even more than the army of his country needs him.

In support of such a belief, we fortunately now have the benefit of an experiment conducted within our own land during the past three years, the experiment of the military training camp at Plattsburg. We do not have to depend upon the experience of other nations, cogent and persuasive as that experience has been. I have yet to meet a man who has been through the course at Plattsburg, or the father or mother of such a man, who has not become a convert to the benefits of field military training intelligently applied to the American youth. During the past hundred years, the people of this country have been rapidly changing to an indoor race. From a nation of vigorous and hardy frontiersmen, over 90 per cent. of whom lived on the farm or in the forest, we have become rapidly transformed into a nation with no longer a western frontier and over a majority of whom live in constantly en-

larging cities. The preponderance of modern city life with its softening influence upon the fibre of body and resolution alike is a new phenomenon upon this planet of ours and one, the effect of which upon our race, is yet to be appreciated. We only know that this influence is thrown tremendously against those hardy outdoor virtues of mind and body in the atmosphere of which the foundations of this republic were laid.

We also know that there has been pouring into this country and those cities a vast stream of immigration composed of men who never had the training in loyalty to American institutions which was instilled into our fathers by the wars, the privations and the common experiences of our national growth. We know that many of these immigrants have come here not to assume but to escape national duty. We know that many of them have come with a very imperfect appreciation of the necessity of taking up any duty to the state, let alone that duty of sleepless vigilance required for the preservation of liberty. During the past two years, we have had ugly revelations of the imperfect way in which these men were being assimilated into our self-governing commonwealth under our existing institutions.

Can one think of these considerations and not be clear as to our duty? Can one think of the soft, undisciplined American city boy, or the torrent of humanity that has poured in upon us from Southern Europe, and wish to have any portion of our young manhood exempted from any influence which will tend towards hardihood and discipline, towards loyalty and patriotism? Can we watch the steady ranks at Plattsburg standing at attention in the evening light as the call to the colors sounds and not wish to have our whole citizenship feel the thrill that then ran through us?

I have no patience with those critics who say that universal military training is at variance with the ideals of progress in our democracy. It is at variance only with the false notions of democracy held by men whose grasp on reality is feeble. With the only possible democracy, democracy in this plain old world of ours, with all its limitations of human nature, language, race and sex, universal military training is not alone consistent but it is the only basis upon which such a democracy can safely rest. It is one of the surest levellers of undemocratic distinction. It is one of the surest means by which the modern boy can be brought face to face with both the hard and the noble

facts of real life. It is the only way in which some boys can experience the elemental facts of hunger, cold, exhaustion, or may learn of the vital stores of nerve, grit and courage by which such evils can be met.

It is one of the surest ways to learn the nobility which underlies our common American nature. It is the simplest method in which they may learn at its foundation and in the manner never to be forgotten, the duty of the individual to the state and the flag which symbolizes that state.

In conclusion I wish to point out briefly what I deem to be the practical deductions following from these considerations. The men who object to universal training, not only misconceive the great democratic function of such training but many of their so-called practical objections are rooted in a misunderstanding of the necessary scope of the proposition.

If I am right in the deductions which I have traced from our experiences hitherto, the essential purpose of this training is to get the American youth out of doors and to train him intensively in the field. To house him in barracks or schools would be destructive alike of the military effectiveness of the training and the great economic benefit to American health. Furthermore the meaning of intensive training is that it should be applied in a single unbroken period, during which the pupil's attention is concentrated upon his military work with no intervals for distraction or forgetfulness. The great lesson which Plattsburg has taught the Regular Army is the superiority that such intensive training has over all other kinds and its immense possibilities in shortening what had previously been considered the minimum time required to make a soldier.

The logical conclusion from these premises would be that the bulk, if not all, of each man's training would be applied in a single period of about six months spent in the field, in the open season of the year, under the instruction, so far as possible, of the class of instructors which have made the work of the military instruction camps such a success—the officers of the Regular Army.

It has been the view of the progressive officers of our army, embodied in the report of the General Staff on the Organization of the Land Forces of the United States, in 1912, that, assuming competent instructors and a proper staff organization,

such a period would be sufficient to form a respectable army. The experience at Plattsburg, so far as it has gone, has served powerfully to confirm the views then enunciated by the General Staff. The recruit in six months would receive over 1200 hours of training as against the 192 hours per year which is required of the militia by our new National Defense Act, or more than six times as much training as is received each year by the present cornerstone of our citizen defense.

Again those who raise the question of expense have never considered the enormous saving to be derived from transferring the military policy of this country from a basis of pay to a basis of duty and patriotism. The item of pay for the Regular Army has hitherto constituted fifty millions of our one hundred million army budget. Under the militia system of our present law, we pay the National Guardsman at the same rate as the Regular for field service, besides the pay which we give him for armory drills. Under the system of universal training, as carried on in other democracies, this item is practically wiped out, nor would there be any of the expensive army posts which now serve to increase the cost of our military establishment. Careful calculations made by the officers of the Regular Army indicate that we could train for six months the estimated 500,000 youth of this nation, who reach the age of training each year, and are physically fit, for less than half the money we have spent during the past six months in the barren job of mobilizing 138,000 Guardsmen upon the Mexican border.* If we had done

---

*The cost of the Militia Mobilization of 1916 was as follows:

Actual expenditures from June 18 to Oct. 31, 1916, $151,034,566.61. Upon these actual figures the total expenditures up to Dec. 31, 1916, are estimated by the War Department to exceed the sum of $190,000-000.

Estimated current cost for 6 months training for a half million men per year by intensive method including among other expenses, transportation, rations, clothing, ammunition and maintenance and replacement of ordnance and quartermaster stores; also including hire of camp sites, maintenance expenses of cantonments, and pay of instructors and officers, $86,351,854.90.

This latter estimate was made by Major General Leonard Wood before the Senate Military Committee. In comparing the two, however, it should be borne in mind that the militia expenditures covered more than current running expenses and included many expenditures for purchase of semi-permanent material, as horses, motor lorries, etc.

that last year, what a difference would we have achieved in the defensive position of our country and in the efficiency of our youth!

All in all it seems clear where runs our course of national duty. The paths of principle and expediency merge together in the same direction. Let us make no more false starts or be satisfied with further half-way measures.

America is worth defending properly and American manhood should be trusted to respond to the same motives of efficient patriotism upon which other republics rely.

CHAIRMAN SUTHERLAND: The Golden Rule to which Prof. Thayer referred, and which some of us have heard of before, has, when applied to a government, a negative as well as an affirmative expression. It is not only "do unto others as you would have others do unto you," but "do not permit others to do unto you what you would not do unto them." (Applause.)

In view of the startling statements, but the perfectly truthful statements just made by Mr. Stimson, it is perfectly evident that if this government of ours expects to carry out the negative part of this rule, something must be done. I for one believe that we are confronting one of three alternatives; first, we must build up a great standing trmy—a professional standing army; we must resort to compulsory universal military training, or we must face in the future, and perhaps in the near future, some great sacrifice.

I for one do not believe in building up a great professional army. (Applause.) I do in all my heart believe in compulsory universal military training. (Applause.) I am sure that our young men would be physically better for that training in time of peace and I know the nation would be far safer in time of trouble.

Little Switzerland with her population of less than that of the State of New York, can mobilize half a million men in twenty-four hours. If we had had in operation for the past twenty years the Swiss system in this country, we could mobilize in a very brief period of time twelve million men and with those twelve million men I venture to say there is no country in the world and no combination of powers that would undertake to attack us. (Applause.)

Mr. Willet Spooner, of Milwaukee, has an announcement which he desires to make.

MR. WILLET M. SPOONER of Milwaukee: Mr. Chairman, I have been requested to make the following announcement: The Committee on Resolutions, Mr. Guy Murchie of Boston, Chairman, will meet in this hall immediately after adjournment tonight.

The Sub-Committee on Patriotism through Education and all representatives of Universities and Colleges will meet in the Cabinet Room, New Willard Hotel, promptly at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The Sub-Committee on Universal Training and Service, together with the representatives of patriotic societies, will meet in the Mezzanine Room, New Willard Hotel, at 10:30 to-morrow morning, and not in the Fairfax Room.

The Sub-Committee on the Army will confer with Mr. Huidekoper upon this platform after adjournment, and will meet again in the North Hall of the Willard Hotel at noon to-morrow.

The Sub-Committee on Woman's Work will meet at 3:30 to-morrow afternoon in room 1003, 10th floor Willard Hotel. We regard the work of the women as the most important and hope that the meeting of this Committee will command the consideration which it deserves.

CHAIRMAN SUTHERLAND: I am asked to announce that immediately after the conclusion of the speeches here tonight there will be a remarkable motion picture, or a series of motion pictures on industrial preparedness.

It is next my pleasure to present to you Rear Admiral Fiske, who will address you on the subject of "Naval Power." (Applause.)

THE NAVY IN ITS RELATIONS TO AMERICA AS A WORLD POWER

Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, U. S. N., retired.

We know that America is a world power, and we know why. By reason of the moral grandeur of the principles on which her government is founded and the eloquence with which those principles have been declared, the sympathy of the high-minded

in every country is prepossessed by her. By reason of her distance from the Powers of Europe, and her consequent aloofness from the causes of quarrel that continually disturb their peace, none of those Powers finds grave cause of disagreement with her. By reason of the intelligence and character of her people, the vastness and concentration of her territory and the greatness of her sources of wealth of many kinds, every nation finds it to her interest to be on terms of friendship with America. The Powers of Europe that are rivals in many ways, are rivals also in striving for the good will of this wealthy nation; and America finds little difficulty in keeping on friendly terms with all, even while declaring some doctrines, such as the Monroe Doctrine, to which most of them do not accede. America has great power.

Is her power securely held, or insecurely held?

Before answering this question, let us realize that there are three kinds of power which nations use in dealing with each other; moral power, economic power and physical power.

In the matter of moral power, America has no superior. No other nation has laid more stress on moral considerations; no other nation has declared itself actuated by higher purposes; no other nation has more emphatically disclaimed motives of material gain, than have the government and the people of America.

In the matter of economic power, no other nation, except the British, has in recent times appealed so strongly to the self interest of other nations, not only by reason of her present wealth, but equally by reason of her prospective wealth; wealth which the imagination cannot grasp, but which the figures of the economist can picture clearly. Every nation would sacrifice much, rather than lose trade with America by war.

It is clear, therefore, that America's world power is securely held in whatever ways moral and economic forces can hold it, and that it will continue to be securely held, so long as moral and economic forces are the only ones that threaten her. But suppose that some great Power invokes the aid of physical force; will America's power then stand secure?

No. We do not even have to think before we answer. Every intelligent person in Europe, Asia and Africa knows that, if America were attacked with physical force, she could make but a weak resistance; a resistance far less than the resistance neces-

sary to repel an attack from over sea, made by any nation with whom war is reasonably probable.

This means that America's standing as a world power rests on two forces only, though the standing of every power rests on three forces; it means that America cannot exert that particular kind of force which is needed when national life is imperilled; it means that America lacks that especial kind of national force that always has been the most essential to national longevity; it means that America is like a woman, because she has to depend for her safety on the absence of physical danger, or on the strong right arms of others; it means that America's attitude is feminine, not masculine; that, in the family of nations, America is a female.

But we are told that America is not going to be threatened with physical force; that the nations abroad are too busy fighting each other; that when they are through, they will be too exhausted to fight anybody else; that though no nation on the earth has ever enjoyed peace for many years in succession, yet that nevertheless perpetual peace is not only possible but probable—at least for America.

Passing by the fact that such declarations are flatly contradicted by the successive events of history, and not even pointing out that the nations now fighting can rest and then fight again, it is sufficient to note that those nations have been fighting with armies, and that only navies would be needed for fighting us, re-enforced by a few thousand highly experienced troops, before whom our wholly inexperienced troops would go down like ten pins. No reason is apparent why, after this war shall have been finished, and the warring nations shall have become friends together, bound together by the tie of a common suffering, a small invading force could not be sent across the sea that could accomplish everything they might desire, including the capture of our national capital and the metropolis. If the armies are too exhausted to fight, fleets only need be sent; fleets which will not be exhausted, but rather suffering from inaction, and which will be able to blockade both our Atlantic and Pacific ports, shell New York, and bombard all our coast cities with bombs dropped from aeroplanes despatched from the blockading ships. Let us realize that every bit of the experienced, organized physical power in

the world will be in their hands, and that America will lie tempting and helpless before them.

We are told that moral force is of a much higher order than physical force, and that economic force is also. We are told that physical force is the lowest of all the forces man can use. Doubtless it is; but for that very reason, it underlies all the others, and is fundamental to them. It is older than all the others, is founded more deeply in human nature and for that reason lives longer in times of stress. The highest faculties of men are the first to die; the lowest are the last.

Furthermore, no force can do the duty of another force; neither moral force nor economic force can do what physical force can do; nor can both do so together. Human nature in men and nations is such that the appeal to the higher feelings, and even to self-interest, fail, when the passions are aroused; and even if the passions are not aroused, the most skillful negotiations sometimes meet a situation in which the self-interests of all parties cannot be satisfied; in which the interests of one party are directly opposed to the interests of another, and in which neither will yield except to physical force. Resort to physical force by nations is resort to war.

America possesses great physical power, because of the abundance of her material resources, but she cannot use it; her physical power is potential not kinetic, latent not active. It is like the power of Niagara, tremendous in its total value, but mostly unavailable. The facts that her physical power is great, that it could be made available in time, and that urgent causes of disagreement have not arisen between her and any great foreign Power for more than a hundred years, have combined to dull our perceptions to the necessity for making enough of this potential power available to guard our coasts. Yet we must, must, must, guard our coasts—or perish.

Into what form shall we put the available power we need? There is only one form in which it will effectually serve us—the Navy. The navy is the only great kinetic power America possesses; the only concentrated, directly available power, the only thing on which the standing of America as a world power can be securely based; the only thing which embodies the physical power of the loosely tied political parties, and individuals of America; the only instrument with which that physical power

can be externally exerted; the only means with which America can exert her power, when it becomes necessary that she exert it with success, or die.

The Navy is the only means with which to save America, when the time comes to her that comes to every nation, when moral and economic forces fail to act, and nations fall back on the primal resource of physical force; when the artificial aids that diplomacy has constructed fail to operate; when those great crises occur that force men to come down from the soft seats of comfortable civilization, and battle on the common ground of common humanity for their physical lives by means of physical force; when everything is forgotten but the necessity to fight, fight, fight.

And we shall have to fight again. No nation, even China, has ever been able to keep from fighting very long. The difference among nations is not so much in the quantity of the fighting that they do as in its quality; in its success or failure. The question with us is not shall we fight—but shall we fight successfully. The matter of fighting we cannot control for long; but America is so strong potentially that it is in her power to control the question of success or failure. The only means of success is the navy.

The American people must decide whether the navy shall fight successfully or unsuccessfully. The question is perfectly plain. The question is shall America cease to continue as a Power; shall the Star Spangled Banner cease forever to wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave; shall there be no land of the free and home of the brave; shall "My Country 'tis of Thee," no longer be sung; shall the cause for which our fathers fought become a cause which their sons surrendered; shall the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States become forgotten scraps of paper; shall liberty and union cease to dwell together; shall the vision of America become a dream that is past; shall government of the people, for the people and by the people perish from the earth?

The answer comes from Bunker Hill and Yorktown, from Lake Champlain and Appomatox, from Santiago and Manila; it comes from Washington and Jackson and Grant, from John Paul Jones and Farragut and Dewey, from Patrick Henry and Webster and Lincoln; it comes from every true man and woman

who has ever lived, or who lives now, under the stars and stripes; it comes from every decent man and woman who has ever lived in any country and in any time; it comes from every living creature of the earth, and the sea, and the air, that has the heart to defend the thing it loves.

CHAIRMAN SUTHERLAND: The next and last speaker of the evening is one who has rendered distinguished service to his country, both in the field of diplomacy as Ambassador to Russia, and in the field of executive service as Secretary of the Navy. You all know what an anti-climax is. Something of that kind happened in the Naval Department immediately after George von L. Meyer ceased to be Secretary of the Navy. (Applause.)

DIPLOMACY AND OUR NAVY

George von L. Meyer of Boston, Mass., former Secretary of the Navy

"Diplomacy is a development of civilization that was instituted to avoid war *i. e.* to help nations to accommodate themselves to such an understanding as would permit of an agreement to keep out of war."

Armed force has always been a factor in the continued existence of every Sovereign State. Without an appropriate armed force, sovereignty and freedom from foreign control cannot be maintained.

Egypt existed as an artistic, industrious and military nation for nearly 4000 years, but was finally forced into a condition of dependence by the Persians. The time of her greatness coincides with the time of her greatest military power, and the occasion of her decline accompanies her decline in the arts of of warfare.

Persia, rising rapidly by military power, pursued a life of conquest for 250 years, but yielded gradually to the seduction of luxury, and was conquered by Alexander of Macedonia who in 12 years overcame two of the most wealthy countries of the world—but went to pieces again almost immediately when Alexander died.

Greece enjoyed a prominence for about 150 years, but fell before the superior military force of Macedonia by neglecting the practice of military arts.

Rome as a great nation lasted about 500 years. In Rome the army was able to preserve internal order and keep the Barbarians at bay for nearly 300 years. Finally the effeminacy of the people, particularly those in higher rank, undermined the government, and in 476 A. D., Rome was taken by Odoacer and a condition of confusion prevailed through Europe, until Charlemagne founded his Empire about 800. It consisted practically of what is now France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Belgium and Holland. He endeavored to form a united people but it fell apart soon after he expired.

From that time to the end of the middle ages there were only four great countries in Europe; France, Germany, Spain and England. Spain has dropped out and the other three nations remain.

That which has most effected the rise of nations has been military power, either on land or on the sea, and that which has caused the fall of a nation has been the superior military power of an adversary.

The nation that has achieved greatness and then been subdued has fallen generally due to a weakened policy brought about from increased luxury and loss of forceful qualities.

The nation which loses the proper balance between military and everyday life and thereby neglects military requirements of the time becomes vulnerable to attack.

The causes of war in the United States have been civil and not military.

It will be interesting to consider what role the Navy has played in the four principal wars in which the United States has engaged.

In the war of the American Revolution it was the English Navy that demonstrated even 140 years ago the possibilities of seizing a base on our shores and transporting troops across the Atlantic. It was the French Navy arriving at the psychological moment and supporting the troops under Washington that enabled him to achieve success and gain our liberty and independence.

In the war of 1812 it was only the skill and feats of some of our individual Naval Captains which affected insurance in England and terrorized their merchants and thus preserved our reputation in the arts of war and defense.

The British Navy, however, was so superior in sea strength, thanks to Jefferson's unpreparedness policies, that they were able to send their fleets across the ocean, land forces on the shores of Chesapeake Bay, march to Washington, burn the Capitol and other public buildings, encountering feeble and discreditable resistance.

In the war of the Rebellion, a strong and powerful Navy possessed by the North might have demonstrated to the Southern leader more than any arguments the futility of seceding, and might have been conducive to the acceptance of some of Lincoln's policies.

The weakness of the Confederacy lay in its dependence on a revenue from cotton and its inability to export to foreign countries and to import in return supplies and ammunitions.

Even had the Navy failed to prevent war, if it had been able to have established instantly a blockade of all the southern ports, it would have shortened the war by several years and saved an incalculable amount of distress, life and property.

In the Spanish war, which was the result of mis-rule in Cuba, and the blowing up of the Maine in the harbor of Havana, the only land engagements were some minor ones in Cuba and the Philippines.

The important operations were Naval. The destruction of the Spanish Fleet in Manila Bay by Admiral Dewey, the annihilation of Cevera's Fleet by Admiral Sampson off Santiago de Cuba, these victories caused Spain to make peace. On paper the Spanish and American navies were about on the same footing, but it turned out that they were even less prepared than we were. Had our Navy been made up of a fleet of battleships commensurate to our requirements, as the instigator and supporter of the Monroe Policy, Spain would never have gone to war with us, our treasury would have saved $500,000,000 expenditure and loss of life would have been spared, and diplomacy with a strong navy as our background would have prevailed between the two countries.

The Russian-Japanese War only came about after Japan was satisfied that further diplomatic parleys were futile as regards their conflicting policies. Japan feared Russian extension, particularly in Corea, while Russia desired a more satisfactory outlet to the sea in the East.

Russia's statesmen failed to see as early as the Japanese that diplomatic negotiations would fail. Russia relied on the fact that she was much larger, richer and more populous. Japan, realizing this, was the first to get thoroughly prepared and was the first to strike, and consequently the victor.

Russia was able to transport her troops without possible interference from Japan to Manchuria. Japan could only do so by transports across the sea of Japan. Therefore, Russia should have realized that her problem was to have assembled a fleet of sufficient strength in Port Arthur to command the sea and prevent transports from coming from Japan. She underestimated her adversary's Naval strength and preparedness, and Japan was able to reduce Russia's Navy in the East to such proportions that it was of no avail in preventing Japan's troops from landing.

It is well for us to remember in America that the final engagement at Tsushima between the Russian fleet sent out from the Baltic and the Japanese fleet, took place 12,000 miles from Petrograd. The Japanese sunk nearly all the Russian vessels at slight cost and loss to themselves. It was practically this naval battle that settled the fate of that war. It was also the knowledge at Tokio of Russia's naval weakness and unpreparedness that caused Russia to fail to impress Japan as to Russian policies and threats.

The function of a Navy is not only to defend the coast, but it may be more effective to exert force at a great distance from its own coast.

Nelson routed Napoleon's fleet off the Coast of Spain and thus defeated his plan for invading England. Thus the most effective defense may be offensive defense.

There are many in this country who have thought that because our adversary would have to traverse 3,000 miles of the Atlantic, or 5,000 on the Pacific that we were comparatively safe and that all we needed was a few forts and submarines. None of our forts have guns that could reach the enemies' battleships while their guns were storming us; and while it has been demonstrated that submarines can cross the Atlantic under their own

power, they have not shown their ability to destroy the English battleship fleet in the North Sea and thus open commerce to the German ports.

If our people desire that our ships may sail into any port, that our citizens may travel with security abroad, and that our merchants export and import goods and supplies to and from other countries—then we must have a Navy equipped and prepared to uphold our policies and meet our requirements.

It may be stated now, according to Admiral Fiske, that a battleship of 30,000 tons, such as the navies are now building, with twelve 14-inch guns, is a greater example of power, under the absolute direction and control than anything else existing. If an automobile tank could be constructed carrying twelve 14-inch guns, twenty-two 5-inch guns and four torpedo tubes of the size of the Pennsylvania, be able to run over the land at 20 knots an hour, propelled by engines of 31,000 horse-power, it could whip an army of a million men just as quickly as it could get hold of its component parts. It could mow down buildings in cities, destroy all bridges and sink all shipping. It has also been figured that a fleet of 16 battleships, with all its guns mounted, taking the power of the modern musket as a unit, is equal to 5,000,000 modern muskets.

It was probably due in great part to Mahan's book, "The Influence of Sea Power upon History," that the German Emperor started with vigor to increase the German Navy to an extent which has surprised the world.

Mahan proved that sea power has been necessary to a nation for commercial success in peace, and military success in war and that it has exercised a determining influence upon history.

Admiral Fiske stated lately that the greatest probability of war is between two countries, of which one is more wealthy and the other more powerful. To-day probably this country, due to the great European War, has become the most wealthy and there are several countries which I need not mention that are to-day more powerful. At the end of the Confederate War, we were probably for a short time, the most powerful military country when Grant had his army of veterans, seasoned and equipped. So, at the end of this war there will be several countries with armies and navies seasoned and equipped ready possibly to demand enormous claims for losses in Mexico for which they

may feel inclined to hold us responsible for our interference in Mexican affairs and our pusillanimous policy since then.

We must bear in mind that the Monroe Doctrine is as strong as the fleet and no stronger.

Now, in addition to supporting and enforcing our policies, what would be the primary use of our Navy? It would be to prevent blockades.

Take New England, how long would it be before the mills would be shut down, if coal could not be transported there by sea—and what would be the condition of this country if its commerce, amounting to over $4,000,000,000, were paralyzed, as is the case in Germany?

A coalition between two countries, one in the Pacific and the other in the Atlantic, would be the simplest method to force us to grant their conditions and secure indemnities which would refund their entire war expenses.

The United States is pathetically weak as to preparedness for war, while exceptionally well off in the raw material required for military strength—as a peaceful gain-loving nation we are not far-sighted and Mahan tells us that far-sightedness is needed for adequate military and naval preparedness, especially in these days. Furthermore he told us that when the Canal through the Isthmus of Panama was completed, the Caribbean will be changed from a place of local traffic to one of the great highways of the world, bringing the interests of other great nations along our shores, as they have never been before, with the responsibility of maintaining and protecting this great route of commerce, we can no longer stand aloof or possibly keep clear of international complications.

Our position with reference to the Panama Canal will resemble that of England to the Channel, and that of the Mediterranean countries to the Suez Canal. Have we prepared ourselves for this responsibility, or is the Secretary of the Navy studying the international situations which may call for the need of a Navy in the Caribbean, or the length of time that will have to elapse before our Navy will be ready to fulfill its obligations? Have any steps been taken towards solving the problem by making an estimate of the situation, as is now adopted in the Army and Navy Staffs of all the great countries?

We should realize in this country that we have practically no army and no reserve. The lamentable weakness and unpreparedness of our militia and its uselessness as a mobile force, has lately been demonstrated to ourselves and the world, when President Wilson ordered the mobilization a few months ago. In case of a conflict with a foreign power, the burden will fall upon the organized military fleet, and if that fails what structure of defense have we to fall back upon?

DeWitt, the great Dutch Statesman, in speaking of his people said that unless danger stares them in the face, they are indisposed to lay out money for their own defense. Liberal to profusion when they ought to economize, and sparing to avarice when they ought to spend.

This same reproach would apply to the Congress of the United States.

There is no nation in which sea power will in the future play a greater and a more decisive part as to its destiny, than that of the United States.

That the United States is deficient in sea power, there can be no doubt—Mahan claimed that its foundation could only be laid in a large commerce under her own flag. He further stated that history, almost without exception, affirms that this is true—save with the Romans, there is no marked instance to the contrary—and he went so far as to say that it was not necessary to go to a very distant past to prove that if legislative hindrances be removed, and more remunerative fields of enterprise filled up, the sea power will not long delay its appearance.

Admiral Fiske stated before a Congressional Committee that it would take five years to put our Navy in an efficient condition of preparedness. He added that the Navies of Foreign Powers were increasing in strength and going to continue to increase—that every advance of civilization will advance the Navy—every new discovery and invention will directly or indirectly serve it—that the Navy more than any other thing will give opportunity for mechanism and to mechanism.

I have told you that in war, a Navy's primary duty is to protect its coast and the trade routes of the country. If it is much more powerful than its adversary's navy, it can accomplish this by blockading the enemies' ports and paralyzing its commerce, as has been done by the English navy.

This has been a masterful stroke and without its accomplishment, Germany would probably have won out in this war before now. Therefore, no matter what the British Navy cost, it has proved to be a good investment as well as an insurance for the English people and their institutions.

The same reasons that apply to Great Britain maintaining a powerful Navy are applicable to the United States. And since it has been proven to England that a Navy is best for her, it does not require much foresight to predict, that with the policies we have adopted, the obligations we have assumed as to the Panama Canal, and with the enormous increase in the expansion and development of our commerce, that a great Navy, efficient and prepared, is best for the interest of the country at large.

But how are we to get this great Navy with its efficiency and preparedness? The common idea is that a Navy consists in having a number of ships. The first essential of a Navy is a mind, which makes a necessary estimate of the situation, makes plans to meet it and carries them out—which trains the men and designs the ships. I stated last winter in Washington at the Security League meeting, that the trouble with our Navy was that it had no mind. Mr. Daniels took it as a personal reflection as to his brain matter. Navy men knew that I referred to lack of organization, which in the armies and navies of Europe are known as a staff. I knew that Mr. Daniels had disrupted an organization which corresponded to a staff, and which was instituted in 1912 as the outcome of the study of Admiral Mahan and a group of officers, and three years elapsed before any substitute was put in its place.

With a proper mind, or organization, efficiency can be brought about by a study of war conditions, by planning, by training, by discipline, by energy, by constant target practice, by fleet manœuvres, and annual mobilization of the entire Navy—both in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

As a consequence of the outcome of the battle of Tsushima, the war between Russia and Japan was destined to result in favor of Japan—yet the Russian Fleet in number and size was slightly greater than that of Japan. But the Fleet of Japan was directed by a mind more highly trained than that of Russia's, and the officers and men in Japan showed the results by the performance of the various duties in the actual battles which

only come from practice of preparedness in time of peace. Absolute preparedness of both personnel and material is necessary because events follow so rapidly after war is declared that little or no preparation of personnel can be made in the Navy when war is once begun. Russia lost nearly all her ships and thousands of her officers and men, and the nation lost the whole object for which the fleet had sailed twelve thousand miles from Petrograd—an expensive demonstration to a nation of trained intelligence and preparedness, versus unpreparedness and unintelligent training. We ourselves had an experience 100 years previous in Massachusetts Bay when the American Frigate Chesapeake was captured and the majority of her crew killed and wounded in fifteen minutes by the English Frigate Shannon, almost identical in size and gun power, but better trained. Yet the Shannon had traversed 3000 miles.

Preparation for war has always been known to be essential. It should be better known now than ever before. Lack of preparation has never been due to lack of knowledge but always to neglect. A distinguished critic has said that the factors that decide which nation shall be the victor and which the vanquished, are determined before the war begins, they are simply functions of preparedness. If our policies are sufficiently important to our well being, we must be ready to maintain them by force. That is, we should have sufficient force to match the size and importance of our policies.

China has never had diplomatic importance with other nations because she has been without force, and her requests and arguments through her representatives have met only with kindly tolerance. Her representatives have maintained business relations, but nothing resembling diplomacy. China herself has always been compelled to yield to the demands of other nations because she has never been prepared from a military standpoint to deny them. China's only chance has been when she traded on the rivalry or jealousy of one nation against the other.

The possession of Naval force has always been a powerful factor to England in backing its diplomatic arguments or demands—the power that is seen but not mentioned, yet nevertheless a determining factor and always an assistance.

Men's minds are so constituted that the prestige of an individual, an organization or a nation has a practical value and an actual force.

Whether democracy can meet the demands of modern times is a question of growing importance in view of the startling example of Germany's efficiency, both industrial as well as military.

There can be no doubt that other nations will learn wisdom from the bitter experience of this war. Are we alone to remain unprepared for emergencies, enriched by the misfortune of nations across the Atlantic.

Are we willing to give up the Monroe Doctrine?

Are we willing in all international disputes to give way and sacrifice the prestige of the United States?

Are we willing to say to all citizens of the United States, you leave the territory of the United States at your own risk; the United States will not extend the slightest protection on sea or on land of other nations?

In the past with the vast amount of immigration into this country, the safeguard of our Republic has been compulsory education. With conditions in the world existing as they do, the welfare of our people and the preservation of our institutions, depends in the future upon compulsory training, both military and naval. Let our people understand throughout the land that there are duties of citizenship that we have been neglecting. Let us instill into our hearts the spirit of the Minute Men of Concord and Lexington. Let us not sacrifice the valor of youth through the valor of ignorance, but let us train every citizen before he comes of age, as Switzerland has done, in the art of defense and in the science of organization and efficiency. Then we will have no fear as to the American prestige, its Navy or its Army, its patriotism, its safety or its honor.

MR. S. STANWOOD MENKEN, of New York: Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word, if I may, in the nature of an announcement. The moving picture which you are not asked to pay for but which will be presented, "The Eagle's Wing," is a picture of the interior of the arsenals and the industrial plants which have been opened for the first time by the Government, in order that they might be taken for this particular presentation.

We know it is late; it is quarter to eleven, and we feel that you have more than done yeoman service to-day. Those who stay will see a very interesting and delightful picture and I am sure will be repaid for waiting for it.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Murchie has a resolution.

MESSAGE TO MR. CHOATE

MR. GUY MURCHIE, of Boston: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am requested to propose the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, the National Security League is in Convention assembled, on the happy occasion of the eighty-fifth birthday of its revered Honorary President, Joseph H. Choate, and

"WHEREAS, it is the unanimous desire of the League to record its recognition and appreciation of his eager devotion to his country and of his far-seeing Americanism,

"RESOLVED, That we, the members of the Natioanl Security League assembled at Washington, do hereby send our affectionate and loyal greetings to Joseph H. Choate, our Honorary President, and we do hereby express to him our sincere belief that his unfailing patriotism will long inspire his fellow Americans." (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN SUTHERLAND: You have heard the reading of the resolution. Those in favor of its adoption will signify by saying "Aye." Contrary "No." The resolution is adopted.

There being no further business, the meeting will stand adjourned.

THIRD SESSION

Friday, 10:15 A. M., January 26, 1917

New Willard Hotel

AMERICANIZATION

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 A. M., by Prof. William H. Hobbs, of the University of Michigan.

PROF. WM. H. HOBBS: Mr. Coit, of the American Defense Society, through indisposition, is unable to be present this morning. It is my pleasure to introduce as the presiding officer one of the most modest and unobtrusive, and yet one of the most active and efficient of all preparedness advocates of this country, Mr. Raymond B. Price. (Applause.)

MR. RAYMOND B. PRICE: Ladies and Gentlemen: Within a period of two years Great Britain has raised an army of five million men, a voluntary army trained, officered and equipped and sent them to the corners of the earth. Perhaps when history is written that achievement will be recorded as the greatest in the history of mankind up to date. But that achievement does not stop with the soldier. Six million men have been withdrawn from the pursuits of commerce and industry and yet Great Britain is breaking all of her records for production. Months ago seven hundred thousand women were employed in the munition plants of that country and they had invaded even the most sacred precincts of skilled labor. To see women tool-makers, women finishing the most delicate parts of Maxim guns, women building ships and making boilers, marks a new achievement for womankind and one that this world must sooner or later reckon with.

There are over five thousand factories in Great Britain operated and controlled by the British Government. Groups of those factories, working on more or less identical products, are put in

the hands of experts, perhaps sixty or one hundred persons in the charge of one efficiency man. It is thus possible to measure the relative efficiency of those different plans. As a result of this new unit of comparison, it has been proven that more work can be accomplished, more products produced by working six days a week than by working seven.

Also in similar fashion, the net results have been measurable, showing the advantages of hot lunches, of sanitation and of good ventilation. Investigation is being carried still further and includes even the effect of clothing. As never before the human being and the human body are being measured in relation to their condition, and the result of their efficient preparedness for the work they are called upon to do.

In spite of all the war troubles and all the war problems never have the British people given so much attention to the housing of their people. It is no idle talk that has suggested that the British national credit should be utilized to re-house the working people of that country.

Many here may remember that Bismarck forty years ago argued that every man was entitled to the right to work, every man was entitled to be free from the worry of possibly being sick and disabled, and that every man was entitled to a comfortable old age and to reasonably comfortable living conditions. That is one of the most important foundations of German patriotism to-day, and the world is just beginning to learn that lesson.

In Great Britain the Research Committee of the Privy Council, composed in part of men with white hair, but having the enthusiasm of youth, and the open-mindedness that one does not associate with traditional British conservatism, is searching the world for better methods and better mechanism and applying them to their problems. Their belief is that the future of the world and the future of their country depends upon scientific methods and scientific men, and their idea of that is not limited to the material but extends well into the human. We are just beginning to perceive in this country that foreign competition may force us to do things that our religion, our own sense of justice and our American ideals, have failed to make us do in the past.

I wonder how many Americans have stopped to think of what goes through the mind of the immigrant coming to this country? He comes here with ideals and anticipates keenly his arrival in the land of liberty, the land of promise. I wonder how many

Americans know what his reception is? Received with indignity and in many instances, exploited upon his arrival, robbed and given no chance to find out what the ideals are and even how to share the privilege of the American citizen. This is his reception.

When we come across a man who has been through that experience, who has like the children chased the rainbow, the rainbow of American hope, but instead of finding the pot of gold has found instead all the indifference, all the ostracism, all the hardship, all the pain and suffering which we as a people have permitted to be heaped upon him, when such a man has gone through such an ordeal and still has faith in that rainbow, then, indeed, we owe something to that man.

We are fortunate in having with us this morning a man born in Vienna, who has come to this country with hope and faith, and in spite of all that he himself has been through, and in spite of all that he has seen his fellow-comers go through, he still has faith in American ideals and is to-day endeavoring not only to help his fellow-wanderers, but also to Americanize Americans.

I have the great pleasure of presenting Prof. Edward A. Steiner. (Applause.)

NATIONALIZING AMERICA

By Prof. Edward A. Steiner, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

The invitation to be present at this Congress, and have a share in its deliberations, made its appeal to me not only because I regarded its acceptance as a great privilege, but also as an urgent, patriotic duty.

This latter appeal was especially strong because I was born into your national life out of the womb of one of the immigrant ships, and have entered into a great civic heritage through the ministration of your court of Naturalization.

Belonging as I do to that great patriotic society, the Sons and Daughters of the Steerage, membership in which will not be claimed by our descendants, I feel honored and challenged by this representative assembly, because it meets in the nation's Capital, at this most august period in the history of our people.

Our country, which holds its unique place in the world, because it is made up of human fragments, drifting together

through all the years, has in consequence acted like the seismograph, which records even the faintest tremor of the earth's crust no matter how distant be the disturbance. So, every tremor of human society, whatever its cause, wherever it may have occurred, or how strong or faint it may have been, has been felt, and has left its impress upon the structure and the soul of this nation.

Whether it was the great reformation, or the shifting of a trade route; potato blights in Ireland, or one of its revolutions; the nationalistic revival in Germany, or the failure of the cabbage crops; the philoxera in the vineyards of Croatia, or the language struggle in Austria; the Czar's ill humor or a bloody pogrom; all these had their influence upon the number and the type of people who come to these shores and helped to shape its destiny.

If many of our people were undisturbed by these far off events, or but dimly felt their import, it was due to the fact that they were absorbed in the development of their own country, distant from the Old World. They were undertaking a vast and wonderful experiment in government, and were passing through a new experience in the history of the human race. They were busy winning a country in a struggle with vast distances, forbidding deserts, and primeval forests, and separated by the ocean from the Old World, they believed themselves immune from its social and political ills and plagues.

More than any other people of whom we know, they were being shaped unconsciously by events, rather than consciously by men. Beholding as they did, the marvelous, unchecked growth of their country, the shaping of its affairs in orderly fashion, the stabilizing of its institutions, and the development of a national consciousness, they were content to let events shape them, and regarded any serious interference akin to sacrilege.

Even to those of us who know the course of history or profess to know it, and can be made to forget the present day shibboleth "Economic Determinism," the achievement seemed marvelous, if not miraculous. We have suddenly come upon a great moment or the moment has come upon us when we feel ourselves constantly and profoundly affected by the Old World events. Even the most remote village feels it; for loaves of bread have grown smaller, and battleships larger, the color of cloth has grown paler, and the newspapers more lurid; some of

us have grown fabulously rich, others incredibly poor, not only in money, but in faith in those things which are the highest wealth of the individual.

Had we used the munitions we manufactured and helped to pay the war's debts in the lives of our brothers we should not have been more profoundly or painfully moved; for then we would have been moved in but one direction. Now we have the uncomfortable sensation of being shaken first one way, then the other, after the manner of an earthquake.

What this war will mean to the Old World we do not know, for thus far, only the kings have spoken. What the people will say, when the battle fever is over, we can but guess. It is not easy to prophesy about Europe, and about the United States there is no need of prophesying.

For none of us will life be the same thing it was, prior to that fatal date in nineteen fourteen. None of us can live as we have lived, nor teach, nor bargain, nor think, nor preach. If we do, we are acting in contempt of the Spirit of the time; which it is no sacrilege to call the Holy Spirit.

Gone is the old optimism which made us rise every Fourth of July, and challenge the whole world to stand up for a licking. We are now possessed by a spirit of pessimism, which is equally dangerous; for as once we exaggerated our virtues and our strength, we now are in grave danger of exaggerating our faults and weaknesses.

We have called each other pacifists and militarists; and could there be more terrible opprobrium?

We have prophesied our becoming Chinafied or Prussianized, and could we foretell a more terrible fate?

We have declared our youth effeminate, and certain sections of our country incapable of thinking, nationally, and have accused a large proportion of our people of being afflicted by the hyphen; could we imagine a more loathsome disease?

With a fair knowledge of the peoples of Europe, and an intimate acquaintance with the people of this country; with a love for them which admits of no cheap optimism, and a faith in them which repudiates a blighting pessimism, I can assert that we are in no danger of being Chinafied, for we are naturally too pugnacious. Our climate, diet, and historic development will see to that.

We are in no danger of being Prussianized, for we are too individualistic, too impatient with slow, historic processes, and too unamenable to discipline.

We are a nation. The varying, historic background of our colonies is all but forgotten, the boundaries of the states carved out of huge territories are nearly obliterated, and are evident to the casual traveler only by the care of difficulty he may have in securing a divorce or drink. We have a national symbol, more sacred to us than that of any religion. You may, from almost any platform, in any place question the meaning of the Cross, or cast aspersion upon this or that church; but insult the flag, and your journey out of town will be more swift than comfortable.

Politically we are so unified, that recently we passed through a presidential election with two platforms so much alike, that if the label of either had been lost we would not have known the difference. Its result was so close that we congratulated and condoled our respective candidates three times a day for three days, and many a newspaper printed the picture of the President-elect wearing a beard. No matter how much we feared the results, we are all loyal to the nation, so that we regard the present incumbent of the White House, the President of the United States, with whom we will gladly co-operate in strengthening and purifying the national ideal, in making our patriotism effective for the time of peace which we trust may be perpetual, and for the time of war if war should be inevitable. This Congress is in itself an augury that this is possible, and no less that it is necessary.

There are, however, certain definite elements which make up an effective nationalism, and in all of these we are more or less deficient.

First. In order to develop an effective, national spirit, there must be a full, unhindered chance for economic well-being. Whether we like it or not, the noble virtue of patriotism rests upon economic foundations. Men begin to love their country when they find in it food and shelter, they fight for it when their pastures are threatened, and their harvests endangered, or they leave it and forget it when bread can be more easily secured elsewhere. The history of the migration of the people of Europe to this country, is proof of that, if proof were needed. It was at any time a comparatively small number of people that

sought in this country a sanctuary for their ideals, or came because of the ideals they expected to find; free land and not freedom was the magnet which drew the majority, and those who sought the first were not necessarily better material out of which to shape a free nation than those who sought the latter. The lure of America was its wealth, and not until later did the Goddess of Liberty light her beacon for them.

The sacredness of religious history is not demeaned when one discovers how close to its root are the lower senses and appetites; and the proverb: "The way to a man's heart is through his stomach" need not lower the ideal of the love of a man for a woman.

It may even be true that the divorce mills would have less grist to grind if the grist were better prepared in the kitchen. It is also true that a fine patriotism is developed when the common man belongs to a state which looks to his well-being.

If the sense of belonging to the nation has remained weak among the people of our alien population, it is because we have permitted them to remain alien to us and because we have had little concern for their welfare.

Patriotism cannot easily be bred in our satellite cities, begotten in greed, mere reservoirs of human power, to be used, and abused as we do not and dare not now abuse what we call our natural resources.

The second element in which we are lacking is the sense of social cohesion, and that, in spite of the fact that here theoretical democracy was made practical, and that our historical institutions rest themselves upon the ideals of democracy. The most powerful factor in welding our unwieldly population into a unified people, is the sense of equality. Nothing more quickly wins the allegiance of an alien than the fact that he may belong to this country and to his fellow citizens. I am capable of analyzing this feeling through personal experience, as well as in the lives of that great multitude whose feelings I have shared.

Nothing which I have experienced in my rather eventful life has so thrilled me as being able to stand in one of the great thoroughfares of our cities and see the passing throng, of many colors and conditions, of all tongues and creeds, and then to feel myself able to say, "We, the American people."

Nothing has so dismayed me and made me fear for the future of our country as this growing menace of class, of race and re-

ligious prejudice, that makes this phrase which we have written so boldly and bravely upon our basic national document, an empty one if not a lie.

We dare not tolerate in this country any affected superiority, based upon wealth, or race, religion or section. We are either one people or we are nothing.

The only tolerable claim to superiority, is that of service to the state, and thus far no class or race or section or religion has developed a monopoly in that direction. Even that race, the only one involuntarily among us, toward which we have been magnanimous but rarely just, has not as yet failed us or will be likely to fail us in the great national crisis. Not long ago it was my great privilege to foretell by voice and pen that the hyphen is not a symbol of divorce but of marriage; that those of us who are alien born, would vote as our conscience dictated, not as we were commanded, and I am not ashamed of my prophecy.

We cannot safely plan for a national future, without learning how to co-operate with all its diverse elements, or without teaching them to co-operate with us. There is nothing in any class or creed or blood of any of our people, to make co-operation for the common weal impossible. The only barrier lies in our untutored prejudices, in a false pride, and narrow vision, which would all give way in a moment of grave national danger. It would be a part of the wisdom of preparedness to realize this before the danger comes.

Thirdly we lack a constructive, national educational program. The public school is the only institution we have which may be put wholly at the service of the state for the development of its ideals. Our public school system, admirable as are its underlying purpose and its ideals, is chiefly distinguished by the fact that it is not a system, but a chaos, created by the anarchic American home, the thousands of independent school districts, and the politicians, who use the schools for selfish or partisan ends. As for the educational experimenters, they have with a few notable exceptions, made our confusion worse. The chief aim of many of them has been to train teachers how to teach so that the pupil does not know he is being taught. I have listened to lectures upon how to teach algebra by rhythm, chemistry by absorption, and manual training without work.

The whole tendency has been how to turn work into play, and play into work; the result being that we have organized re-

creation and disorganized education. Our children are the most indulged children in the world, which does not say they are the happiest; for happiness consists in doing one's work well, and in giving other people a chance to be happy. We are an undisciplined people, because the authority of the parent is practically gone, and the schools have not yet learned how to exert theirs.

From somewhere the schools must receive power to check social excesses and the resultant physical degeneration of our youth, and must call them from the sidelines, where eleven overtrained boys are making a Roman holiday for them, furnishing exercise for their lungs only. From somewhere, and God only knows from where, the colleges must get strength to lead in this reform; for they dominate the whole horizon of our youth, who imitate the worst phases of college life.

We need to cultivate for them some form of physical training, which shall become a national form, and be adapted to our national needs. This should develop not merely the student's body, but also his sense of co-operation, not only with a team at school but with the nation.

The competitive element is altogether too highly developed in us. We have athletic teams in one primary grade, preparing to "wipe up the earth" with the team of another primary grade. "Kill 'em! Eat 'em alive!" are interesting slogans for savage tribes, menaced by other roaring savage tribes, but accomplish little toward the development of physical power, its control or its use for the good of all.

As a whole people, we must learn to believe that while bodily fitness is necessary for the nation's well-being; we must also know that the nation which is to maintain its place or assume leadership of other people, will do so, not by physical power alone if at all, but by the power of ideals capable of realization, which means that it will lead by the power of a well-trained humanized intellect.

During the Russo-Japanese war I was traveling in the Volga region. A Russian soldier whom I knew came hobbling along on one leg begging for a little tea money. I gave it to him on the promise that he would tell me about the war.

"It was this way, Barin," he said. "Our officers told us that we were big Russian giants and that those little yellow Japanese monkeys would run when they saw us coming.

"They did run, Barin, but they ran after us. You know the Japanese fought with their heads and we fought with our fists; they hitched their donkeys to their wagons and we made officers of ours."

In the long run, wars are lost or won in the schoolroom, and we must teach our children to think seriously, achieve thoroughly, and hate mediocrity.

There is little danger of our boys becoming effeminate, in spite of the fact that they are more exposed to the influence of women than the children of any other nation.

The American boy is neither gentle nor yielding, nor is he noncombative. All these qualities he should have imbibed through long association with the gentler sex. I think I know the American boy, and the one I know the best is the child of the most pacific race in the world; the race in which the hope of peace on earth as a possible ideal had its birth. His forefathers listened to the prophets, who foretold of an age when swords and spears should be turned into implements of industry. His father is an avowed pacifist, with an unshakable faith in the workability of the program of Jesus; yet when this boy was asked what he wanted for a Christmas present, he replied, "a gun."

Our boys are physically the most daring I know. Their cowardice is intellectual and not physical. They will fight with a bravery unequalled, but they may fight a losing battle; because men nowadays are fighting with their brains, even when they shoot.

What is going on behind the battle line is of more importance than what is going on in the trenches.

Probably my inability to enter sympathetically or understandingly into the educational chaos of the United States, springs from the fact that I was trained in schools which were part of a national program, in which all the schools, whether maintained by the church or by the state, were included, and whose product for better or for worse was stamped by the national spirit. I am not sure that this is possible here; but if we wish to develop some common national ideals, if we wish to make the whole nation capable of taking its place in the competitive struggle sure to grow stronger rather than weaker, we must learn to think of all the schools for the training of our children as a national institution and under some form of national control.

Lastly we must remember that we are deficient in those powers of idealization which alone are capable of transmuting land into fatherland, speech into mother tongue, sound into national airs, and the common struggle of a people for existence, into glorious history.

When Mr. James Bryce was asked what was the greatest need of America, he unhesitatingly replied, "Poets." The man whom it is difficult to call Viscount Bryce, because he seemed so much like an American at his best, and who perhaps knew our country and its people better than any other man who has ever been our guest, knew as well the power of sentiment in the making of a nation. Neither men nor nations live "by bread alone," and without vision they must perish.

Nor do nations fight for bread alone, and if they do the soldiers must not know it. Patriotism has the power of the primitive religions, and men and women will offer their children upon the altar of the nation long after they have repudiated the gods who demanded them. It is a pure mysticism, reason has nothing to do with it, it lies entirely in the sphere of the emotions, which may be awakened and wisely directed.

Our land is as yet unsung, except in small spots, and these spots are trebly glorious because the poet has touched them.

I am not worrying because we have no National Opera. Let us first have a tolerable national hymn. It is most pathetic that our children, when they sing on those festive occasions when the national ideal should be stamped upon their souls, sing sentimental love ditties or worn out snatches of Italian operas, which even the organ grinders have discarded long since.

This sentimentalism may seem to you trivial, but it has seemed so important to the most successful nationalized states, that they have furthered it by all possible means. School children were sent on pilgrimages from the country to the city and from the city to the country, to see the capitols, the monuments, the mountains and rivers. Song contests were arranged, under the patronage of kings, and the winners became almost as famous as our football heroes. I covet especially for the children of the immigrants, a sight of their great capitol, historic rivers, and the everlasting hills, so that perhaps the slumbering power of their psalmists may be awakened ere it die forever in our crowded tenements.

History is still to most of us a portrait gallery, and its idealization is due largely to the great men who have passed along its path. Take from our records the names of Washington and Lincoln and our sky becomes as dark as the night without its stars. They are the pillars around which we twine our banners. It is they who many a time have drawn us out of the mire of partisanship and have set our feet upon a rock. It is they who have reminded us, or ought to remind us, that citizenship is more than the privilege to vote or to run for office. It is they who call to us that we are in dire need of leaders not only in the exalted places in the nation's capital, but in the heart of our villages and cities and counties. Though they are dead they must speak to our youth, to consecrate themselves to the humblest place in the nation's service if they wish to share in its exaltation and in its immortality.

We lack a national passion which may beget us the men we need. Great leaders are born out of a nation's desires, they are begotten in the travail of a nation's hopes. Thus the prophets came to Israel, and the Christ was born.

We are living so much in the present that we care little or nothing for the future. We have developed a passion for heroic ancestors, but not for illustrious descendants. Many of the women who are talking birth control should talk birth courage. Ancestors cost nothing, descendants cost much. The consecration of children from the mother's womb to the service of the state is an unknown rite with us; even the old-fashioned hope of every boy to be president some day had in it prophetic power, and it is a pity it is no more. The passing of this desire may be due to the fact that we pay scant honor to our civil servants, and that we drag them into a mire of criticism which is more cruel and less rewarding than a martyr's death. Criticism in a government like our own is necessary, but it must be just and it should be respectful.

I have frequently quoted the foreigner whom I interviewed as to his reason for bringing his children to this country. This was his reply: "I taka my children, send them school. Little school, big school; then send them college, and when they got finish they can say, 'To —— mit der President.'" The lesson is obvious.

I must guard myself against the inference that I believe that our youth are not idealistic. I know none more so, the world

over; none more willing to make sacrifices, but the state has not as yet captured their imagination.

May I recapitulate? We are a Nation, greatly differentiated from other peoples in spite of our relationship to all of them. We are a political unit, the divisions in our political faiths merely emphasizing our unity. We lack, however, an orderly care for the economic well being of those dependent upon their bodily exertions for daily bread. Their sense of the injustice they suffer is growing so strong that it may permanently alienate from the state and its ideals, those born among us, and also keep alien those who are foreign born.

We are in grave danger of being unable to fuse the nation into a necessary unit because of the growing lack of democracy in our social life, and the intensity and blindness of our racial and religious prejudices. As no other people in the world, we need to cultivate the virtues of justice and sympathy; train ourselves for co-operation with the unlike, and need to give immediate consideration to the training in the same direction of those who may be the weaker and newer peoples among us.

We are an undisciplined people, physically, morally, and intellectually. The public school system must become nationalized in as far as that is possible. It has back of it an admirable purpose, and the most idealistic, but also the most inefficient teaching body in existence. We must ask our specialists to define for us the scope of a public school education; what share it may have in the making of citizens, and how this is to be brought about. Then we must bring every school, whether public or private, whether supported by a church of a foreign national body, into harmony with this program. This must and may be done without interference with the religious sensibilities of the parents, and without exclusion of those cultural elements which are dear to the hearts of the foreign-born.

We are also somewhat deficient in the power of idealising our national possessions. Richly blessed, with a marvelous country, dowered by a past full of romance and heroism, we must stimulate the idealism of our youth and awaken in them a passion for their country and a willingness to serve it. These are some of the factors which I believe to be essential to the making of a nationalized America. Beyond that we need to be possessed by the sense of our great responsibility and our absolute dependence upon a power not our own. For there are two Americas, the

one in which we live, materialistic, but not to the core; sordid but struggling not to be; disorganized in many of its phases, but with a marvelous sense for unity; intolerant but hating intolerance; narrow, but striving to be sympathetic; unjust but smiting itself for its sins; selfish, but with a genius for altruism.

The other, the America we want it to be is still in the making, and for that new America, the better, stronger, nobler America, a struggling world is waiting, and when it comes it will hail it as once it greeted the new continent as it rose for them as if it were virgin from the sea. But this nation must be no replica of Germany, no matter how perfect we may regard the nationalization of that state; nor another England, though she be our mother; nor yet another France, no matter how glowing her patriotism. It must be again a New World, with a new ideal of the Nation. Here we may and must harmonize, all the hopes and dreams and ideals of our people; here, to quote a noted Frenchman, "we must make of our culture a symphony, which shall, in a true way express the brotherhood of individuals, of race and of culture, blended together. Here we must make real the dream of an integrated humanity."

For such an America the world is waiting. That way lies her high destiny. We are still young and at the nation's dawn. What the day will be when it comes upon us we know not, "but with no past to clutter our path," without any weariness of the yesterday, we can determine what it is to be. That fact ought to make our deliberation solemn, purify our motives, elevate our thought, and direct our will. The most American of poets, the poet who typified America, unchastened, heroic, elemental, may help our anxious march toward this goal.

"Have the elder races halted?
Do they droop and end their lesson, wearied there beyond the seas?
We take up the task eternal, and the burden and the lesson.
Pioneers, O pioneers."

CHAIRMAN PRICE: The photographer requests your attention for a few minutes.

(A flash-light picture of the Congress was then taken.)

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Fifteen years ago an American woman trained to the law was faced with a decision as to whether she would follow her profession to comparative wealth and

prestige, or whether she would devote her life to the things that were most worth while. She decided to consecrate her life to the achievement, as far as her assistance could help, of social justice. Miss Frances A. Kellor has for many years devoted her strength and her energies and her exceptional abilities to studying the problems of humankind, especially of the less fortunate. She has worked beyond her strength and at the last moment has broken down so that she cannot be with us to-day. Those who are familiar with what she has done in the cause of Americanization will appreciate how every one of us here owes her a debt of gratitude, and I would like all those who wish to express their sympathy in her illness, their appreciation of what she has done, to rise.

(The Congress tendered a rising vote of appreciation to Miss Kellor.)

CHAIRMAN PRICE: It will be a real pleasure for Miss Kellor to have that great uprising in her behalf.

One sometimes questions as he watches the co-ordination of effort in Europe and in Japan, whether a nation without centralized leadership can compete, and in fact question whether it can even survive, whether forty-eight almost independent sovereignties, with forty-eight different points of view and different methods of attack, can compare in efficiency in all fields with the governmental activities of foreign nations. Our own government, so little centralized, has seemed inclined to avoid the kind of leadership that perhaps we most need. It is, therefore, a special pleasure to find a department of that government which has the courage and the vision and the energy to start to lead in its particular field.

I am sure that we shall all be glad to listen to Mr. H. H. Wheaton, of the Bureau of Education, who is speaking for Miss Kellor, and also for the Bureau of Education.

ADDRESS

Mr. H. H. Wheaton of the Bureau of Education

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are gathered here to discuss and consider things of importance to our national unity and defense. We are considering from many angles those things which will make this country a unit in thought, in spirit

and in action in times of peace or of war. But, whether we are pacifists and believe entirely in peace at all times at any price, or whether we are militarists and believe in military training, before we can devote our energies in either direction effectively, efficiently, we must have behind us a unified country, we must have behind us a country which is a unit in its language, a unit in its understanding of our common ideals and traditions, and a unit in its aspirations and ideals.

In the making of a country of that type, we must first consider its population and the makeup of that population. We must consider whether it is fully and thoroughly American. In this country we are not to-day a unified country, we are not an American people, we are a mixture of many peoples. We have over fifty nationalities speaking over one hundred dialects and languages; we have three million foreign-born whites, ten years of age and over, who do not speak the English language, and we have hundreds of thousands who do not read or write in any language. We have people in this country who cannot read our newspapers, who cannot learn about the common events of the day except through the mistaken interpretation of some fellow-countryman who speaks their language as well as English.

We have thousands in this country who have no approach to American institutions or American ideas, who cannot get any notion of what constitutes Americanism, except through the medium of an interpreter, except as they may occasionally be in contact with an American in their shop, in their employment, and very seldom in their business life. It is that problem that confronts us to-day, the problem of making the country a unit in its population, a unit in its language, a unit in its understanding of American traditions and ideals. It is a problem, ladies and gentlemen, of Americanizing America. (Applause.) Yes, that is your problem.

In Americanizing America, there are three great forces which can be called into play. Some of them are already more or less active. Those forces are first, governmental public institutions; second, the industrial and commercial forces; third, the miscellaneous civic organizations of the country. We look to the government for initiative and leadership in many undertakings. Unfortunately the government, whether local, state or Federal, has not always arisen to the ideal of leadership, and yet it should lead in the making of this country.

We must look to industry to do that which no other force can do, Americanize its working force, Americanize its plants, and we must look to the civic agencies of the country to do what neither of these agencies can do, to supplement their activities and to aid and bring behind them forces which will solidify population and which will make an industrial Americanization, a governmental Americanization, a real thing.

The particular subject for discussion at this moment is industrial Americanization. Now many people think when we speak of Americanization for industries, we mean welfare work, that we mean carrying on certain kinds of beneficent undertakings for the benefit of the employes, whether they want to be benefitted or not. But we who are engaged in promoting industrial Americanization do not mean welfare work by industry, we mean having something radically different and it is this: Let us consider first what it means to an industry to engage in any kind of non-productive activity. Business and industry is organized for profit; its prime function is in the production of material, of utilizing machinery for this purpose and of producing goods which will sell for money and achieve profit for the men who are conducting the business.

On the other hand, the employe is engaged in that business, is engaged in an occupation because he wishes to earn a living and make money. Hence the primary purpose actuating either the employer or the employe is the acquisition of money, of making money, of earning a living. That is the primary purpose.

Now, to the achievement of this purpose, Americanization has a direct importance which we must view from a certain angle. No man has an interest in his business, and no employe will have an interest in the business, unless he has some part in the business, unless he participates in the business, unless he gets some reward for efficiency, unless he has favorable working conditions, unless he has an increase of wages when he has shown merit, unless he receives some recognition, some sort of contribution to his life and for his industrial efficiency.

Now it is thoroughly American to have proper working conditions in a plant, it is American to have the right kind of industrial efficiency in a plant, it is thoroughly American to have the right kind of living conditions surrounding a plant, or in an industrial community; it is thoroughly American to have every

man in the plant speak the English language. All of these things are minimum standards of an organization in industry.

It is to achieve these purposes that we are urging industry and industrial leaders to engage in Americanization activities. Common language in a plant is of tremendous importance to the industry. First, because it means greater safety and a reduction of accidents; it means, second, industrial efficiency, for the man who understands the orders of his boss without unnecessary explanations is more efficient and will be able to carry out the orders and instructions of the foreman more effectively.

It is of importance to the industry that the man speak English because the reduction of the cost of supervision alone will be enormous.

In the Ford Motor Company, before they instituted two years ago their Ford English School, they found that they had fifty-seven interpreters as foremen. That meant fifty-seven men upon the pay-rolls who were hired to translate, to interpret the orders and instructions, the safety regulations of the plants, into the languages of the employes.

Since the institution of their English school, they have eliminated the fifty-seven variety (laughter) at a great reduction in the cost of supervision and production. They found also that their accidents were 52 per cent. greater two years ago before they began their English training than they are to-day. This means a reduction in the cost of compensation, a reduction in the cost to families, and a reduction in other costs.

I mention these facts incidentally.

Now, living conditions surrounding a plant are important to the plant itself, are important in Americanization. We find many industries having a tremendous labor turn-over. That labor turn-over we have traced to certain definite causes. First, we find prominent among these causes that labor turn-over in a plant is due to the bad housing conditions in the neighborhood, or controlled by the company. The men cannot find, with their wives and families, suitable places in which to live, and it is chargeable largely to the industrial establishment itself, because the industry brought the men there; it desires to keep them there, and upon it is the prime responsibility for seeing that these employes once there are properly housed. Until industry accepts that responsibility toward the employes, whether native or foreign born, we

shall not have those real American conditions in industry which conditions in this country to-day absolutely demand.

The success of any Americanization activity by industry depends upon the angle from which the industry approaches it. If industry approaches Americanization from the standpoint of welfare work, from the standpoint of paternalism, it will fail. In every industry in this country where welfare activities have been undertaken primarily as a welfare activity, it has come either to a standstill or has gradually disintegrated. Welfare work is not an inherent part of any business. Welfare work should be left to those third forces that I mentioned a while ago, the civic agencies of a community, and to the governmental. If the interest of the community does not think that recreation, playgrounds, etc., is to be furnished to employes, it is nevertheless probable, Mr. Chairman, that under most conditions that that obligation to furnish recreation or welfare activity is upon the public, not upon private individual concern. (Applause.)

Industry, however, may do many things which the public cannot do. It may reorganize its plant methods, it may keep better records at its employment office, it may standardize its working force, it may reduce its labor turn-over, so profitable, not only to the plant, but to the community, and it may do a variety of things with the management of the plant itself and surrounding the plant itself, which no other single force can do.

In the doing of these things and in the accomplishment of those standards of Americanism in industry which I have mentioned, the most important factor is the industrial engineer, the professional engineer, the man who is trained as a housing expert, the man who is trained in the management of the plants, the man who is trained in the employment of men. These engineers, these experts in management, in plant administration and in the organization of industry, these are the men upon whom we must depend for the solution of Americanization problems in industry.

The engineer selects the location of a plant. Is it healthy? The engineer selects the location of company houses. Is the environment proper for those houses? The engineer selects the men, the type of men—the social engineer you might almost call him. These men are the men who hold the key in industry to successful Americanization. Until we train those men up to a real status in our American life, until we impress upon indus-

try that these are the men in Americanization, we shall not succeed in solving our industrial problems.

It is the belief of the government, as represented by the Bureau of Education, that industry owes an obligation to its employes; it owes an obligation to those employes which it has secured from foreign countries; it owes an obligation to them because they come to that industry, secure employment there, thrive there, earn their money there, and depend upon that industry for continuous sustenance.

The Bureau believes further that industry can be of tremendous assistance to the Americanization movement by doing certain things. First of all, assisting or persuading every employe in its plant who does not speak the English language to acquire the common language of the country. It believes further that industry can insist upon some citizenship qualifications for its employes, and it believes finally that industry may be the most effective force in getting employes into school, in getting them to learn the English language in our evening schools, in getting them to take the proper industrial and vocational training.

The Bureau believes finally that industry, being one of the large taxpayers of the country, can do more than any other single factor in backing up governmental agencies that many times are struggling to achieve results against tremendous opposition. For that reason the Bureau has called a series of conferences, the first of which will be held a week from Saturday, and the subject for consideration is "Industrial Americanization."

We have called that conference because we believe that industry and educators should go hand in hand in the solution of the tremendous problem of Americanization; that there should be a closer working agreement, an arrangement between them, and that those two forces when gotten together upon a common platform can build a real national Americanization policy.

In this work we have certain ideals. Those ideals are American, and we have chosen a slogan, namely, "America First." The meaning of that term has been sometimes brought in question. Some have attacked it on the ground that it meant shallow Americanism, petty Americanism of America always first for itself in everything, a selfish purpose. But America First, ladies and gentlemen, means more than that, if it means anything at all. It means America efficient, it means America first in ideals, it means America with courage, it means America before social and

industrial justice; it means America for Americans truly, but it means America for humanity. (Applause.) It means America first in allegiance to a common plan, to a common country. (Applause.) America first in service to each individual in this country and as far as we can to other countries and to other people. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN PRICE: I desire to make an announcement, as follows:

The Committee on Resolutions will meet in room 128, at 8 o'clock this evening. This is an important meeting to consider the reports of sub-committees.

The Sub-Committee on Resolutions will meet in the ante-room between 12 and 12:30 this noon to receive and hear any suggestions for resolutions.

The Efficiency Committee will meet in room 128, at 1 p. m. to-day. Dr. Frederick A. Cleveland, Chairman, The Woman's Committee will meet in room 1003, at 3:30 this afternoon.

The International Relations Committee will meet at 3 P. M. in room 128, Dr. David J. Hill, Chairman.

The Sub-Committee on Patriotism Through Education is holding sessions in the Cabinet Room, and the Sub-Committee on Universal Military Training and Service is holding its sessions in the Mezzanine room.

The Army Committee will meet with Mr. Frederick L. Huidekoper, in the ante-room at noon.

The Navy Committee will meet in room 1003, at 2 P. M., J. Bernard Walker, Chairman.

The Americanization Committee announcement will follow later.

By special arrangement, we are to have the privilege of hearing another American point of view from Mr. Ludwig Nissen. (Applause.)

REMARKS

Mr. Ludwig Nissen of Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I thank you for this mild, kind reception. (Laughter.) I hope you will reserve just a little bit of applause for the time when I leave the platform, for I am going to say to you frankly that I am going to strike a discordant note. Yesterday afternoon, there crept into the speeches of Judge Parker and of Senator Elihu Root, certain statements which many men would say that because they were

based upon misinformation, that they were not true. I will content myself with saying that they are questions of dispute between foreign countries, which had no business to be brought into this discussion. (Applause.)

I heard last night one hundred times that Senator Root had made a great speech. (Cries of "He did." "He did," with loud and prolonged applause.)

I have only got a few minutes, so let me talk, will you? (Laughter.)

I admit that he made a great speech, one of the greatest that I ever heard if delivered in the proper place. But it was the rankest outrage ever permitted and perpetrated upon an American audience upon this particular occasion under the guise of American patriotism. (Hisses and cries of "No." "No.")

All right, gentlemen, you can hiss and you can say "No," but I have been invited on this platform to have my say.

A DELEGATE: That is an American.

MR. NISSEN: I am a rock-ribbed American. (Applause.) I am an American from choice; most of you could not help yourselves, and I am not even a German.

A DELEGATE: Well, I am an Englishman.

MR. NISSEN: Well, are you a citizen?

A DELEGATE: Yes, sir.

MR. NISSEN: Thank God for that. There is not one out of a hundred Englishmen in this country who is. Gentlemen I have not the advantage of having been on the program, or of having been able to prepare my speech. I did not know until late last night that I would have the privilege of saying a few words. I was going to content myself with just offering a solemn protest against turning this Congress of Constructive Americanism into a pro-Allied propaganda. (Applause.) We know that England has paid propagandists in this country. (Hisses and shouts of "No.") I say yes.

A DELEGATE: How about Germany?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to have order.

MR. NISSEN: No paid propagandist could possibly have spoken more effectively for an English Propaganda than Senator Root did here last night. (Hisses.)

Now, both of the gentlemen yesterday touched very strongly upon the crime that Germany had committed upon Belgium. I want to answer that, ladies and gentlemen. Ninety-five per cent.

of the people in America cannot possibly know anything about European conditions except what they read in the newspapers and ninety-nine per cent. of all that you read in the newspapers are lies. (Laughter and cries of "No!") That is a courageous statement to make on a platform in Washington, I know, and I will be derided, and I know that what I am saying here to-day will not be reported by the newspapers, because the newspapers will not print a bit of news that is favorable to Germany under any circumstances whatever (Hisses), because if they do they will lose the advertisements of the financial interests and every d——n one of them is subsidized by that institution. (Cries of "No" and hisses.) Excuse me, the example was set for me by somebody else, and I have only learned that in America. Like Dr. Steiner, my language, my Americanism, had to be acquired, like my citizenship. I know that I will not be able to make a remarkable speech to you (Cries of "Go ahead" and cries of "No, sit down.") after having been preceded by Judge Parker and Senator Root. I have never tried to be a statesman. (Cries of "No, no." Laughter and applause.) I am a plain ordinary unsophisticated business man.

A MEMBER: Very ordinary.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: May I interrupt a moment; we will have to have order and allow the gentleman to proceed.

A motion was made and seconded that the session adjourn.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Mr. Nissen has only five minutes to finish. By special arrangement and in order to avoid complication, this privilege has been given, and I ask that you let Mr. Nissen have his say with as little interruption as possible for five minutes. (Applause.)

A MEMBER: Why not give the speaker a square deal? He is sincere.

MR. NISSEN: Ladies and Gentlemen, I confess that I am a very ordinary, unsophisticated business man, right from the bowels of the steerage of an immigrant ship, and dragged through the gutters of the Bowery in New York into that kind of Americanism that has been able to sustain itself, and that is what we want to teach all the people in America. I am not going to go into any more platitudes, I am going to defend the action of Germany against Belgium. (Cries of "No." Cries of "Let him do it." Hissing.) Won't you hear the truth? (Cries of "No.")

A MEMBER: We know the truth.

A MEMBER: You can't tell the truth.

A MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is out of order.

MR. NISSEN: I know the truth, but it is evident you don't. Senator Root and Judge Parker referred to Germany's action against Belgium as a crime. (Cries of "It was.")

There was no crime because there never was a guarantee and there never was an understanding. But American newspapers won't print the facts. Gentlemen, I just ask you to hear this; I am not going to denounce anybody, because I am afraid of rotten eggs. (Laughter.)

In 1839, England, France, Austria, Prussia and Russia entered into an agreement to respect the neutrality of Belgium. Mind you, it was Prussia. That neutrality was respected up to 1870, when Emperor Napoleon declared war upon Germany. At that time no less a statesman than William E. Gladstone said as Prime Minister of England in the Westminster Parliament, that that agreement could not be considered binding upon either of the parties to it. He insisted upon making a special treaty with France and with Germany which lasted during the war and one year afterward, that neither of those two belligerent countries should violate the neutrality of Belgium.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, William E. Gladstone, as Prime Minister of England, said that that agreement, which induced him to secure special treaties from those two countries with England herself, was not binding. What better evidence can you have that there was no binding agreement from Germany?

(Shouts of "Time's up!")

MR. NISSEN: What else? Gentlemen, you don't want to hear the truth.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: We will have to have order. Let me say, please, that if we let our feelings get the best of us there is no telling where it will end. We are here for constructive purposes. I think we had better go on with our program.

A MEMBER: We don't want to hear about the European war on either side. Men can be good Americans and believe in either Germans or the Allies. (Applause.)

G. D. IVERSON of Baltimore: I would just like to offer the suggestion that before any speaker be allowed to address this audience who is not on the program, that he state the subject on which he is going to speak, and if it meets with the approval of

the Congress we will listen to it, and if it does not, we will reject it. (Applause.) I offer that as a motion.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: There is no need of presenting that as a motion, because the other speakers are all known to have been put on the program.

A MEMBER: I understand there is a right of discussion, according to the program.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: If we get through the program on time, which seems very dubious at present.

It is very pleasant to find some city that can carry a lesson home. Detroit, which has grown beyond the imagining of most people who have not been familiar with its development in the last few years, has had to face the immigration problem to a remarkable extent, and I am sure it will be interesting to all of us to hear something about how Detroit has faced that problem, from Mr. Walter C. Piper of Detroit.

AMERICANIZING DETROIT

Mr. Walter C. Piper of Detroit, Mich., former President National Association Real Estate Boards

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: You are here to discuss Constructive Patriotism. Allow me to state a fact that has to my mind quite a tinge of constructive patriotism to it.

On the evening of January 5th, there was held in the auditorium of the Detroit Board of Commerce, a mass meeting of foreign-born citizens to celebrate the fact that there were a hundred per cent. more men applied for citizenship papers in Detroit during the year 1916 than there were during the year 1915. There were more applications for first papers in the city of Detroit in 1916 than there were in the city of Chicago during the same period. This is due to the awakening of the importance of citizenship. This awakening is due to the campaign of the Americanization Committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, and to my mind, this is constructive patriotism.

Just one more statement of fact before I begin this paper. A few days ago in Detroit, there was held the first meeting of the new Women's Americanization Committee. This committee consists of eight women; one from the public schools, one from

each of the chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution and four from the Detroit Federation of Women's Clubs.

This is the final step in the rounding out of our Americanization program in Detroit. It makes the last link in our chain of constructive forces doing Americanization work. It is with no little pride and great pleasure that I announce this consummation of our efforts. The reason I lay particular stress upon the fact of the entrance of women into this field is the indisputable evidence to those who care to read the handwriting upon the wall, that women are slowly but surely taking their rightful place in all activities.

It will not be amiss, I am sure, to discuss before this Conference the great work of Americanization in Detroit in which the Board of Commerce has played so prominent a part. In the character of the Board's work is to be found the answer to the question, "Why is Detroit the leading city of the country in the Americanization movement?"

Ever since 1820 the immigrant has been a problem in this country. Organization after organization has attempted to solve the question of his distribution, his education and his assimilation. It was this increase in number of organizations and institutions that caused all of the preceding movements to produce so scant a measure of success.

The reason Detroit is the leading city in the Americanization movement is because it was the first city where the efforts of a great variety of agencies were co-ordinated under one guiding hand. Here, too, employers realized that the immigrants were a vital and necessary link in their scheme of industrial progress, and that it would be necessary for the employers themselves to do their share if they would turn out the type of American citizen that was necessary to make this progress possible. It may be said that educating the foreigner and instilling in him the first principles of American citizenship is not the business of industry. And this is true. It is not the business of industry alone; nor of the private school organizations alone. It is the business of all of these and it will require them all. Detroit has been referred to as the most American of our cities. To make this true in any except the industrial sense requires a work of assimilation so enormous that every constructive force in the city will be taxed to its utmost to accomplish it. The work has begun, and only begun, in the campaign to fill the night schools. But the union

of community forces attained in this campaign gives promise of the future, and points to a social ideal for other communities in the same direction.

Because the gentlemen who composed the Americanization Committee of the Board of Commerce were far-sighted enough to see that this union of community forces would enable them to attain success in their efforts to Americanize Detroit, our city has become the leading city in this movement. Rochester, New York, for several years has had night schools for foreigners, but only now is the Chamber of Commerce of that city organizing the industries of the city to support public evening schools. The National Americanization Movement has kept a close record of Detroit's progress, and is advising all cities which write to them to model their handling of the immigration problem after what is now known as the "Detroit Plan." Both the Bureau of Naturalization and the Bureau of Education of the National Government have published papers on the Detroit method and are urging other cities of the country to adopt it. Magazines have commended it in special articles.

The business men of Detroit believe in this work because they know there are 60,000 non-English speaking workmen in Detroit. They remember the winter of 1914-15, when the Board of Commerce had to drop all other activities and organize into a monster employment agency to take care of the unemployed. They remember that 23,000 men applied at the Board of Commerce for work, and that 15,000 of them could not speak our language, and possessed not even the smallest skill in the simplest trade. They remember how it was possible to find work for the men who could speak English, and how they were called upon all through that winter to aid in the task of providing food, clothing and medical attention to the families of those for whom no work could be found. When that winter was over, the business men of Detroit came to a realization that the assimilation of the immigrants was not a piece of welfare work, but was a fundamental civic necessity.

They decided that a night school campaign for the English language and citizenship would be a practical approach to the vast and complicated problem of assimilation. They realized that the end to be attained was a social ideal and that, therefore, the ways and means would be those of social co-operation, involving every constructive factor in the civic organization.

Just here it may be well for me to give you a brief description of the ways in which the Americanization campaign is organized in Detroit.

We look to the National Americanization Committee of New York City to act as a clearing house for the activities of all organizations engaged in immigrant work. This organization, together with the United States Bureau of Naturalization and the United States Bureau of Education, constitute our national connection. In Detroit our organization consists of the Americanization Committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, a committee of volunteer business men, employing a paid secretary who devotes his entire time to the Americanization movement in Detroit; the Detroit Board of Education, operating thirty public evening schools properly placed in various foreign sections of the city, under the direct supervision of Mr. Frank Cody, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, who is also a member of the Americanization Committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce; the Recreation Commission, conducting recreation activities in the public evening schools one evening a week under the supervision of Mr. Ira Jayne, Commissioner of Recreation, who is also a member of the Americanization Committee; the Y. M. C. A., operating citizenship classes under the industrial secretary, who actively co-operates with the Americanization Committee of the Board of Commerce; employers of foreign workmen, 350 of whom are circularized, and to whom bulletins are issued, and of whom 175 are active and co-operative; 20 to 25 large employers of foreign labor upon whom the Americanization Committee is concentrating its efforts; local organizations coming in contact with the immigrants, including visiting nurses, employment agencies, associated charities, Jewish charities, foreign insurance societies, foreign churches public library poor commission, foreign language newspapers, local American newspapers, Sons of the American Revolution, and various other patriotic societies.

Our group of activities may be put under two heads—naturalization and English schools. As to the naturalization, our activity consists of co-operating with the clerk of the circuit court, and with the clerk of the United States Court; factory calls on request, citizenship schools open after the regular night school term is over, and devoted entirely to coaching the men in preparation for taking out their citizenship papers; active campaign-

ing, that is, visits by the state naturalization examiner to the plant; the secretary's office conferences with foreign workmen seeking naturalization information, naturalization advice to the regular public evening schools, assistance and guidance by the secretary to groups of foreign workmen; reception to new citizens; aiding in the organization of Fourth of July celebration for new citizens, etc.

As to the evening schools; the activity of our committee consists of an effort to secure a large attendance at these schools by means of a twice-a-year campaign, which includes the distribution of hand bills in the plants, distribution of large colored night school posters, and the publication of a map showing the public evening schools in all the foreign daily newspapers of Detroit. In addition there are factory surveys during the month of August to secure data for factory enrollment; factory enrollment at the beginning of evening schools during September; night school institute; conference with groups of our employers of foreign labor, and the securing of employment for night school pupils out of work. In general, our committee is endeavoring to act as a clearing house for all agencies working with foreigners in the city of Detroit. It assembles and classifies data of all kinds regarding Detroit's foreign population in order that the committee may intelligently handle its own work, and at the same time be an authoritative source of information on the entire subject of the school and the immigrant. It gathers material on social center activities of public evening schools for foreigners in order to make definite recommendations to the public school authorities and to the Recreation Commission. It gathers data as to how individual factories acquire efficient methods of handling the details of the Americanization campaign in their plant. This information is distributed in the form of bulletins after its analysis and consideration by the committee. We are making definite efforts to impress upon the employers of foreign labor the economic gain and the increased industrial efficiency secured by sending workmen to public evening schools.

The ultimate object in view is the organization of an agency that will oversee the development of the foreigner from the time he arrives in the city, and will provide for the proper education, civic training, his naturalization, and all steps necessary to make him a desirable and competent member of the community

Just let me mention the excellent way in which the educational

authorities of the city have supported this movement. Three years ago the appropriation for the public evening schools was $35,000; last year it was $65,000; and this year it is $87,500.

As a result of the first campaign in 1915 by the Board of Commerce to secure a large attendance of the foreign workingmen at the public schools, the attendance at the schools increased 153 per cent. and this year the attendance has again increased, in spite of the fact that immigration from Europe is practically at a standstill.

The result of the campaign to inform the men how to take their citizenship papers and the importance of doing so has been astonishing.

From January to June 1916, there were 5,504 applications for first papers as compared to 2,513 in the same period in 1915. This is a gain of 2,691 or 107 per cent. I should like to quote you the figures for the month of March, 1916, which is the month in which the chief naturalization examiner made a series of talks in Detroit plants and the month following the Packard announcement of "Americans First." In March, 1915, there were 669 first papers filed, and in March, 1916, there were 1,597, representing a gain of 928 or 138 per cent. It is too soon to speak of the results of the night school campaign in Detroit, except as indicated by the greatly increased registration. The ultimate good can only be estimated. The following facts and tendencies have, however, been noted and recognized in Detroit as actual results of the night school campaign, and the vigor of the sentiment it aroused:

1. An increased feeling of responsibility on the part of the employers. This shows not only in the night school campaign, but in the establishment of new classes within separate industries. We were able this year to have the employers of Detroit issue on their own stationery the following statement to their men, which proves that this increased feeling of responsibility on the part of the employers is permanent and real.

A STATEMENT OF POLICY

On January 3d a new term of the public evening school will open in twenty-seven schools. The officers of this company favor the attendance of our non-English speaking employees at these schools.

From and after this date, as conditions will permit, men attending night school will be given preference when applying for work with this company.

If it should become necessary to reduce our force at any future time, we will endeavor to retain a man with a good night school record in preference to a man not attending school.

2. An increased interest on the part of the Board of Education in co-operating with employers and with other social agencies.

3. An increased interest in the parochial night schools throughout the parishes of the city. Especially a new interest in citizenship in the parochial citizenship classes.

4. The opening of more private classes for immigrants in settlements and social agencies.

5. A greatly increased attention to methods of teaching English and civics to foreigners. The Board of Commerce has had especially prepared a citizenship manual done with the immediate Detroit situation in view, and the Board of Education is officially using this.

6. An increased understanding throughout Detroit of the social value of assimilating the foreign population. This is shown in the attitude of both social agencies and of the general public.

7. A gain in methods of co-operation on the part of the various agencies and a realization that the assimilation of the immigrant is not a piece of welfare work, but a fundamental civic necessity.

8. An increase in registration for the night schools among young mechanics. The first night's registration in the high schools show an increase of 25 per cent. over the previous year.

9. A reinforcement of industrial peace, an increased self-respect among the immigrant workmen, and, therefore, a better basis for industrial adjustments.

10. An invigorated understanding of the whole question of American citizenship throughout the city and the state; the first step of a concerted movement toward Americanization in the fullest sense of the word.

The immigrant is a powerful industrial, social and political factor. All the forces of industry, society and political wisdom are needed to accomplish his assimilation. In the Detroit experiment, imperfect and far from consummated as it is, is exemplified that combined co-operation of forces which alone can

weld the many peoples of any community into one body politic, will create throughout the nation the unity and power that come from common ideals, a common language and a uniform interpretation of citizenship.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: There are some interesting talks to follow, and we will adjourn promptly at one o'clock. The Education Committee will meet at four o'clock, in the Mezzanine Room instead of the time previously announced. The Navy Committee will meet at twelve forty-five, in Room 1003, and the Army Sub-Committee is meeting now in Room 924.

While the tendency in this world is toward the submerging of the individual in all of these co-ordinated and co-operating efforts, it becomes more and more important that the individual initiative to counteract that movement, especially in this country, be shown. We have no centralized governmental leadership, as other nations have.

As showing what some individuals can do, we shall be interested in hearing from Capt. E. Rogers Lytton of Summit, New Jersey. (Applause.)

ADDRESS

Capt. E. Rogers Lytton, Summit, N. J.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Were the Arch-Angel Michael, Captain of the Heavenly Hosts, to submit a military efficiency bill to Congress he would not recognize his own measure by the time that august body had put their finishing touches to it.

It is a patent fact (acknowledged by the British Government) that after two years of feverish preparation England even now is scarcely prepared to properly perform her task of self preservation and service to humanity. Yet with this astounding fact before them (would Congress but open its eyes to contemplate it) these guardian's of our nation's honor and welfare, these transmitters of the past to the future, of the heritage of our forefathers to our children's children, devote their time, the nation's time, to talk—to words—to the uttering of sounds.

God alone can forsee when Congress will stop talking and begin doing. And then it will take years—years—years before

their legislative enactments can be translated into military efficiency and national security.

Meanwhile as an humble offering upon the altar of patriotism the men of Summit, N. J., have been doing their part towards forming an American yeomanry against the hour of our country's peril. I cannot do better than to read you some condensed extracts from the first report of our devoted secretary, Mr. Walter G. Libby. You have had to listen to a mass of statistics, principally of things yet to be done, for we Americans are great talkers and leave much for "George" to attend to, but these extracts should interest you for they deal with things accomplished, of the deeds of men who have talked little but done much.

Last spring a group of members of the Summit National Security League were questioning with themselves what they could do to put their belief in National Preparedness into more concrete and useful form. On April 14, 1916, they organized to develop the resources of Summit so that they might be of some real value in case of need. From that little group of eleven men (headed by Mayor Ruford Franklin, their President) has sprung the National Defense Organization Rifle Club of Summit, N. J., numbering in nine months 500 men.

By organizing as a Rifle Club and affiliating with the National Rifle Club we received our charter under Federal Statutes and also an assignment of one rifle for every five members.

Energetic committees were formed to foster the various activities of the N. D. O.

The General Committee devoted itself to perfecting the organization, acquiring equipment, financing the various units, etc.

The Indoor Range Committee and the Armory Committee acting together finally secured quarters in the basement of the Summit Garage (the rent for three years being paid by three earnest members). This basement was then divided one half for the Armory, the other for the Indoor Range.

By the middle of August the Indoor Range was ready. Under the expert and unwearied efforts of Maj. Chas. H. Grant, the executive officer of the Rifle Club and his volunteer range officers, interest in shooting has increased steadily so that the original three targets have been increased to six and in four months we have qualified three experts, 43 sharpshooters and 34 marksmen. Suitable medals provided by the N. D. O. were presented recently. Under provisions of the National Defense

Act, opening all State Rifle Ranges to members of civilian rifle clubs, about 40 members visited Sea Girt at their own expense shooting the N. R. A. course. Six men shot over regular militia course, qualifying three experts, one sharpshooter, two marksmen.

The Infantry Company, organized in July, now numbers 102. It has a record of thirty drills, four marchouts, one field day. The company has qualified one expert, 27 sharpshooters, 23 marksmen in four months and has 29 A 100 per cent., 27 B 90-100 per cent., 19 C 80-90 per cent. men. Men falling below 60 per cent. are dropped.

The Outdoor Range Committee is still struggling with the problem of securing an accessible tract of land that is also safe. A signal corps has secured its initial equipment and drills will commence in February.

The Motorcycle Machine Gun Company Committee has up to the present found it absolutely impossible to obtain any machine guns whatsover. Men, money and enthusiasm are all there. However, we can see daylight ahead.

The Plattsburg Enrollment Committee was instrumental in sending 28 men to Plattsburg, and four boys to Plum Island.

The Automobile Drivers' and Mechanicians' unit has so far resulted only in listing and classifying all registered machines and trucks in Summit and vicinity.

On the calling out of the militia, to which thirty Summit men responded, an "Active Service Information and Aid Committee" was at once formed. Every opportunity to be of service to our men on the border was utilized, to the great satisfaction of the absent ones and their families.

A Secret Service Committee, its personnel known only to Mayor Franklin, has its eyes open.

The General Committee is a unit in favor of universal military training and service, and has established cordial relations to that end with the Summit Board of Education.

From time to time public meetings have been held with prominent speakers and at times a military exhibit. Every effort is being made to educate the public mind on these vital issues. The time has been short but the near future will see yet other opportunities for patriotic service projected and carried out by these energetic patriots.

It were unpardonable presumption on my part to thus parade before you our efforts at patriotic service, did we not believe in our souls that what we have accomplished is capable of nation-wide emulation, in communities where the old American spirit still survives.

But let me here emphasize this vital principle. What we have achieved is due to the fact that Mayor Franklin and his fellow founders recognized and adhered to the true spirit of this communal yeomanry, a spirit without which, all merely local military efforts are foredoomed to failure.

Our N. D. O. stands, in its modest way, for the people. It is of the people, its administration is by the people, and, in its multiple manifestation it is for the people.

An N. D. O. once established and organized, certain of its own members offer their own personal service in such military units as appeal to them (each membership being for one year) with the avowed purpose of so training themselves, against the time of need, that they may be the better fitted to serve their country in whatever capacity controlling conditions may dictate.

Here we have a practical application of the principle of preparedness possible to all local communities without resort to state or federal aid. With 8 to 12 companies standing sturdily on their own feet, the various communities will then be justified in applying for the detail of an officer of the regular Army as resident instructor-inspector for that district. It will be his duty to study all the available and possible resources of the communities that can be of value to the country at large and their own companies in particular. He will consult with the various executive committees from time to time as to the possibilities and means of the mobilization of these resources. He will hold classes and lecture courses for the companies and officers, non-commissioned officers, observe parades, march-outs and drills, offering constructive criticisms, and on the declaration of war, he will assume command of the volunteers, as well as the Home Guard, of the N. D. O., and of the administrative control of his entire "District."

This precautionary system would prevent (in these districts) the panic and chaotic condition naturally resulting from such a catastrophe as war and also afford the Federal Government

time to take over the reins of administrative control. For, each district (owing to its mobilization) would for a time supply, support, and recruit its own quota of men.

This system is limited in its possibilities. It does not consider its activities other than as a stop-gap and a very precious resource in event of the crisis of war coming upon us before the National Service Army (for which we pray) has had time (at least six years) in which to reach its normal proportion and efficiency. But it does claim to be a direct, immediate means by which men of all ages who desire to serve their country in deeds rather than words, may do so without any unreasonable loss of time or tax of any kind and without compromising their freedom of action.

Furthermore, it is of the most vital importance that these organizations must be absolutely and uncompromisingly American in organization and direction. The hour has struck when American leadership must assert itself and dominate the situation. If the spirit of our grandsires still throbs within our hearts then the time has come for American manhood to stand erect upon its feet once more, to claim our right to leadership when the fate and honor of our country are at stake.

Ours is the birthright as the oldest born, consecrated of God, and blessed above our brethren. Ours the birthright to lead our countrymen against our country's foes. And ours the birthright, of all mankind, to bear that flag aloft.

Our flag—wholly ours—holily ours—and ours only.

God bless the flag we love and nerve our hearts and souls to guard that flag so well that nought of harm shall come to it, nor shame befall its sacred folds, while there are American men to fight for it, American souls to pray for it, American hearts to die for it. (Loud applause and cheering.)

CHAIRMAN PRICE: We have had an echo of Concord and Bunker Hill. I hope you will agree with Bernard Shaw that it is more difficult to write a short story than a long one. It is something of an imposition that we have to add one more speaker to speak in very limited time. It is my regret that the exigencies of this session do not allow me the privilege of introducing Mr. Hagedorn, but he will speak this afternoon imme-

diately following Miss Grace Parker, who will be the first speaker.

In the limited time now remaining, we shall be very glad to hear from Dr. C. Ward Crampton of New York, who has a national reputation in the physical training field and in the field of biology.

Evidently Dr. Crampton is not here, and the meeting stands adjourned.

FOURTH SESSION

3 P. M., Friday Afternoon, January 26, 1917

New Willard Hotel

GOVERNMENTAL AND INDIVIDUAL EFFICIENCY

Col. L. D. TYSON, of Knoxville, Tenn., called the meeting to order and introduced the presiding officer, Senator Duncan A. Fletcher.

COL. TYSON: Ladies and Gentlemen, I am not expected to make a speech; I am simply supposed to introduce the Chairman for the afternoon. But I want to say that the National Security League, of which we are members, is trying to get this country to realize that it is necessary for the defense of this country that we prepare, so that we may at all times be able to support the Nation with a powerful influence.

We have, as you will observe on this program, selected gentlemen from all over this country, men of all shades of opinion and from all walks of life, professors, lawyers, business men and others, from all parts of this country, showing it is truly a National League.

We have had distinguished speakers here, and we have heard them from the West and we have heard them from the East. It will be our pleasure this afternoon to hear a gentleman from the South, a man who has been a great constructive statesman. It gives me great pleasure now to introduce to you the presiding officer of the afternoon, the distinguished Senator from Florida, the Hon. Duncan A. Fletcher. (Applause.)

ADDRESS

Senator Duncan A. Fletcher of Florida, President Southern Commercial Congress

Ladies and Gentlemen: There is one respect in which preparedness may be reasonably complete in a reasonable time—that is in respect to efficiency. I mean, we *could* learn to discontinue waste, curtail extravagance and make the best use of what we have.

To guard our 8,000 miles of coast against invasion would be an almost impossible task. A navy second to none and an army of ten million men would protect us from the calamity of war, but it would require many years and millions of money to provide them. Such a program is unthinkable.

We can, however, in whatever we do, exercise judgment, proceed intelligently, industriously, scientifically and do it right.

We can take the material at hand, cut out the dead wood and the parasites, trim up the branches, get rid of diseases and pests and have a beautiful growth, based on efficiency.

We can systematize operations and standardize plans and bring about team work, in a way to avoid waste, get the best results and promote economics.

We can profit by the experience of the warring nations in Europe that have just learned what efficiency means. After over two years of war, a competent authority now says the French factories are 60 per cent. more efficient than they were before the war, although women have to a large extent taken the places of men in them. The same holds good in England. Necessity has taught what could be learned without. Why not put in practice the methods needed to develop the highest efficiency before being compelled to do so by circumstances?

This efficiency should extend to every industry, every branch of the Government, every business that would be involved in case of trouble, including especially our military and naval organizations.

Put our navigable waterways in condition for use. See what tremendous service the inland waterways have been to both Germany and France.

Our highways of every description should be improved in order that transportation might be facilitated. In time of peace

these improvements are most desirable and helpful. In time of war they are indispensable. We need to conserve our natural resources and stop the waste of forests, fields and mines. Timber will be needed in the future. Lands must be cared for, protected and maintained in order that by intensive cultivation the foodstuffs required by our people under all conditions may be produced at home. Coal is too important to be lightly considered. Last April I saw it selling for $28.00 per ton in Buenos Aires. It is necessary to conserve these resources if we ever hope to attain reasonable efficiency as a nation.

When it comes to individual efficiency, we get a notion of the necessity for attention to that subject by referring to the record of rejections by reason of physical defects at the recruiting stations for the Army and Navy throughout the country by the Surgeons. In some stations 75 per cent. of the young men applying were refused enlistment because of physical deficiencies. The young men of the country cannot expect to be efficient in whatever they undertake if they are physically unfit, weak or defective.

Great advance has been made in health conditions in the Army, as shown by a comparison of the sick reports in the Mobilization Camps of 1898 and of the National Guard in the Federal Service in 1916. The inspection reports showed the latter to be 2.8 per cent., which speaks well for the work of the sanitary inspectors of the Army, the medical officers and commanders of the militia.

The system or lack of system in the Army, it must be conceded, is defective, unsatisfactory and means weakness and inefficiency. While we are generally proud of our Army and Navy, when we get down to details and essentials for actual, effective service, we find much to be improved upon. The National Guard, taking its name from the forces of Lafayette, there are many of us who prize and who would maintain, but, the enforced subjections, to their great loss, of hundreds of capable business men to serve on the border under existing conditions and the compulsion to such service of men who are obliged to suffer serious consequences, in many instances involving tremendous sacrifices to their families which would appear unnecessary, demonstrate there are defects in the system.

When the President's call was issued the total strength of the National Guard was approximately 134,000. About three-

fourths of the organizations were called into the Federal Service and in these within a week after the call there were 160,000 men. The supply department could not for ten weeks equip and arm the men recruited above peace strength. Several hundred Florida soldiers slept on the ground for weeks and were without proper clothing, shoes and blankets, because they could not be secured from the Federal depots. To meet the requirements of border service, Congress, in December, 1915, authorized the enlistment of 20,000 more men for the regular Army, and these have not yet been secured. On December 15th, 1916, the authorized strength of the Regular Army was 126,552, while the actual strength was 100,902. It is not likely we can secure the full quota. Recruiting in both the Regular Army and National Guard was disappointing. Men can do better in the industries and will not enlist. We must improve our military system. To avoid a large standing army, the citizen must be depended on and he must be prepared to meet that responsibility. It must be shared by all and shared alike. Universal military training is contemplated under our constitution and was, though inadequately, provided for in our first military law.

We must devise a plan which will leave the manhood of the country free in the exercise of civil pursuits, but schooled and trained and prepared to meet the demands of the country in service, whatever the emergency.

The General Staff favors universal liability to military training and service, and holds that the volunteer system does not and probably will not give us either the men we need for training in peace or for service in war. It is believed soldiers should have in time of peace two years of training with the colors and additional training of approximately two months in the reserve. This seems to be the rule of all the great powers. General Scott holds that twelve months is the minimum time in which you can expect, under a system of intensive training, to make a useful soldier for the battlefield. Now, in time of war, England gives eleven months' training to all soldiers before they are allowed to go to the advanced trenches. We prescribe for the National Guard a period of training of 192 hours annually, which is inadequate. The country needs, General Scott insists, from one to two million trained men—not a standing army of that number, but a citizen force—a reserve able to furnish these men and get them together in 90 days.

It is recommended that the present law be kept in force until, under a new law, requiring universal training and service as a basis of our military system, giving a Federal force without dual control, in the operation of which there would be sufficient men to meet a sudden emergency, the National Guard would be returned to the State's control entirely.

In what I have said regarding our military system I do not mean to question the patriotism or courage of our men from 18 to 45 years of age.

This call to the border was not, in my judgment, a conclusive test of the volunteer system.

There has been a feeling, quite natural, among the militia, that they did not enlist with the idea of being called upon to do what they regard as police duty. In case of actual conflict the resignations by officers, the applications for discharge and furloughs, would not have been thought of nor would there have been any failure to enlist. There would have been, however, serious lack of training and preparation.

Let the call be for real service for a pressing, important object, and you would see these men move to "the perilous ridges of battle" with absolute alacrity and directness of mind and scorn of sacrifice.

Let us hope the time will never come again, and I would not discourage any reasonable effort to prevent it, when the sea will be strewn with mines, the fields plowed with trenches, and the air blasted by bombs, but if it does come and we should be involved, you will see these citizens rally to their flag and witness through them, as well as from the Cambridge's and Trinity's and Oxford's and Eton's and Winchester's of the United States a mobilization of valor such as only a permanent union of free states, under a Democracy, where the people love liberty truly, can produce.

One of our troubles is *inertia.* We are too much given to drifting. You are apt to find the offices of the insurance companies closed when you run to them to get insurance after a fire breaks out in the town.

Chief Justice Marshall declared in 1819—

> "The Government of the Union then, is emphatically and truly a government of the people. In form and in substance it emanates from them. Its powers are granted by them and are to be exercised directly on them and for their benefit."

This was Mr. Lincoln's authority for "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Individual efficiency is necessary to governmental efficiency. The former may exist without the latter, but the latter cannot without the former. Government is not a self-acting machine. It cannot perform its work without or separated from human agency. It daily needs the men to "carry a message to Garcia." There is always plenty of work for the Romans to do. History tells us that 2,000 years ago the most magnificent building in Pagan Rome was a temple erected by Emperor Vespasius and dedicated to the goddess of Peace. Marcus Aurelius declared "War is the calamity and disgrace of human nature."

When we see what is taking place in Europe to-day it would be "plucking the fruit of unripe wisdom" to accept the theory so well stated by Noah Worcester in 1814 and repeated by our pacifist friends to-day, in lieu of the warning of Washington that

> "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

and

> "A free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined, to which end a uniform and well digested plan is requisite."

and

> "If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

and

> "The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that, contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every other nation abounds."

Likewise, we are constantly reminded of the caution of Jefferson that while

> "Nations may be brought to do justice by appeals to their interests as well as by appeals to arms; peace to be permanent and secure must be consistent with national honor and must depend on strength, and I hope it is practicable, by improving the mind and morals of society, to lessen the disposition to war; but of its abolition I despair."

Again there comes to mind the fact that Alexander Hamilton left us his admonition to similar effect—

> "To be in position to defend ourselves will be the best method of securing peace."

and

> "The pains taken to preserve peace include a proportional responsibility, that equal pains be taken to be prepared for war."

To be sure, times have changed. Has human nature very materially altered? Has the enlightened conscience of mankind so advanced as to furnish reliable guarantees? We are less isolated than we were. We are in closer touch with all civilized countries than ever before and our relations are more intimate and varied. This condition rather complicates than relieves us of risk. We are sure to precipitate no conflict, but the more extensive our interests and rights the greater the danger of their being assailed or disputed. It is now suggested that because of the annihilation of distance and time by modern inventions and the extension of business and social intercourse, we are affected by disturbances in other portions of the world, and therefore we might well join the powers of Europe in a league and form a World Court to settle all international differences and agree with them to discontinue all military preparation for defense. This departure from our doctrine which extended only to "temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies," and pledged our non-interference in European affairs and discountenanced the mixing up of European nations in our affairs as well as those of the smaller states in this hemisphere, is a proposal which demands very thorough and serious examination.

In "The American Commonwealth" Mr. Bryce said, in 1888:

> "She, (referring to England) like the Powers of the European Continent, must maintain her system of government in full efficiency for war as well as for peace, and cannot afford to let her armaments decline, her finances become disordered, the vigor of her executive authority be impaired, and sources of internal discord continue to prey upon her vitals.
>
> "But America lives in a world of her own. . . . Safe from attack, safe even from menace, she hears from afar the warring cries of European races and faiths, as the Gods of Epicurus listened to the murmurs of the unhappy earth spread out beneath their golden dwellings." (Vol. I, Ch. 26.)

Nearly thirty years ago this was quite true.

What has come to England out of that situation; if not by reason of it, in spite of it?

Is there no lesson there for us?

Is it not clear the peace of the world will never rest upon militarism or force?

In our case conditions have changed. Political evolution has been at work. Industrial and social development has been in progress. Our products have found their way to the world's market places. The products of nearly every land on the globe come to us. It affects us seriously to be deprived of, for instance, dye stuffs. It is hard on Germany to be cut off from our naval stores, phosphates, cotton and the like. Suppose we could not get rubber, coffee, tea, nitrates and various other goods? Suppose other countries could not get the prime necessities of life we produce? One can to-day encircle the globe in the time consumed by President Jackson in coming from the Hermitage to the Capital. Cables steal out from our shores to every port in Christendom. Wireless messages flash through the air 8,000 miles. The space above has become a whispering gallery. You touch a button and the solemn night bursts into stars. A bank failure in any important city of the world is felt here. A catastrophe in another hemisphere makes a deep impression in this country. These conditions bring on new responsibilities, not chosen and not to be avoided. It is the duty of government to safeguard in all its development the life of the nation.

We are therefore profoundly concerned that tranquility prevail throughout the world and to this end we must find some substitute for war and in its place establish, to remain permanently, blending and harmonizing, political and industrial freedom.

If this can be accomplished by "the guarantees of a universal covenant," by "the organized major force of mankind," "not a balance of power, but a community of power," founded upon "an equality of rights" among nations, great and small alike, recognizing and accepting the principle that "governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed," who would stay the hand thus directed? The man who does that will stand first in the history of the race! He will require no other passport to immortality! If "preponderating armaments" can be dispensed with, if the world's effort can be turned toward peace, and the nations can be brought "to adopt the doc-

trine of President Monroe" and agree to "American principles, American policies," making "armies and navies a power for order merely, not an instrument of aggression or of selfish violence," no one can deny that would be "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

Two powers I could name, with the United States, would be able when the European War is ended to bring about such a settlement and security.

Taking into consideration the mere question of governmental expense and taxation, we must be impressed with the importance of such a solution of this great problem. For instance, the average annual expenditure of the National Government for all purposes for the period 1791-1796 was $5,854,172, a per capita of $1.34. See what the growth has been:

Estimated receipts, grand total, for the fiscal year 1918	$1,007,550,000
Grand total estimated disbursements	1,308,071,000

This does not include Post Office Department estimates, which for the fiscal year 1917, will probably be,

Revenues	$324,500,000
Expenditures	320,500,000

For War Department the estimated disbursements for fiscal year 1918, will be $464,063,000, and for the Navy Department, $366,070,000, making the total expenditure for military purposes $830,133,000 for the fiscal year 1918.

This burden will increase, not grow lighter, if our security is to depend upon military strength. If such a League can be created as would prevent war, make unnecessary great army and navy enlargement, secure justice and give us immunity from attack, let us have it. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: Now, ladies and gentlemen, having taken up so much of your time, I will of course be very brief out of consideration for you, in introducing the speakers.

The first on the program is "The Woman Power of the Nation." We are favored this afternoon by the presence of a lady who has made a study and investigation of this subject, not only here, but in foreign countries, and who is prepared to give us the benefit of her observation and views upon that important subject. It is my pleasure to introduce Miss Grace Parker. (Applause.)

THE WOMAN POWER OF THE NATION

Address by Miss Grace Parker of New York

MISS PARKER: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, upon my return to this country the last of December, I cannot tell you how thrilled I was, what a sense of gratification I had, at finding that the thought of many of the leading Americans had crystallized into a Congress for Constructive Patriotism. If there is one basis, one platform, upon which Americans should and must agree, it seems to me it is a platform for constructive patriotism, for it is a platform in which the women of the country have an equal responsibility with the men.

I have been invited to speak to you on "The Woman Power of the Nation." What the Woman Power of a nation may mean is being demonstrated by what the Woman Power is being called upon to carry by the nations of Europe to-day. My object in going to England to study women's work there was to discover, on the basis of their experience, how perhaps we in America might stimulate and strengthen the Woman Power of our own country.

It is no small service which the women of England are now rendering their country. It is the woman who gives up her husband—or son—her sweetheart or brother to go to the front—to fight for the principle for which she with him is ready to fight. She takes up his work at home—and waits with heroic patience—with heroic courage—for the message which will tell her if her sacrifice is to be put to the supreme test; and when the test comes, she goes on with the fight with renewed courage, with increased determination, that her sacrifice shall not be in vain. For greater than individual suffering, or sorrow is the cause for which they are fighting. One is impressed with the intensity of the conviction of the people of England that the only peace possible—the peace for which the blood of their nation has been shed, for which this generation is being sacrificed, shall be peace for all time—peace for all nations—and until this has been guaranteed the object for which her sacrifice has been made will not have been realized and the sacrifice must continue.

I am speaking of England particularly, because it was there that I spent my time while I was in Europe. England, as you know, has raised an army of over five million men—five million

men, the large majority taken from the trades and industries; and women are filling up the gaps. While, of course, some of the normal industries have been discontinued under war conditions, others have vastly increased. For instance, the piano industry in England has increased nearly one hundred per cent. over what it was the year before the war. The cheap jewelry industry has also grown tremendously. This, of course, is explained by the fact that a large group of working people in England are making higher wages than they have ever made before, and, in consequence, are spending more than they have ever been able to spend before; and some, who have looked forward all their lives to owning a piano, are able—paradoxical as it may seem—to buy a piano under war conditions; and the cheap jewelry business, the man going to the front gives his sweetheart a wrist-watch, or a ring, or a trinket of some sort, before he goes; the wrist-watches, match boxes, identification bracelets, chains, rings, etc., are given to the men who are going; so that trades, such as the two mentioned, which one would naturally think would be greatly reduced under war conditions, are running night and day and employing thousands of women.

In the munitions plants in England over a million and a half girls and women are employed. I went through the munition plant at Woolwich where 18,000 girls and women are now working; a year ago only 400 were employed. These 18,000 girls and women are working in two shifts of twelve hours each, doing all of the work of making shells from the time the sheet of copper is put into the machine until the shells are packed to be sent to the supply bases in England and France. Cheerfully they work the twelve hours, and if you happen to suggest to one of the workers that the work she is doing is hard or heavy, she smiles at you and says: "Well, it isn't easy, but think what our boys are doing." It is the same spirit of sharing the burden of the fight to the end which makes it possible for 9,000 women or girls to sit or stand calm and quiet in total darkness when lights are suddenly switched off in the middle of the night because of a Zeppelin raid. Now and then a group may break softly into singing "Keep the Home Fires Burning," or some other popular song, but there is no panic—no excitement. They are merely sharing what their men at the front are facing. It gives one a bit of a shock to find women and girls acting as railway porters; as conductors on buses and trams; as letter carriers;

as street sweepers; as telegraph messengers; as lamp lighters; as chimney sweeps; as clerks in grocery shops and butcher shops; as cab drivers; as carpenters; as window cleaners; and one cannot but admire the splendid way in which the women over there have adapted themselves to it all. As I was walking up Picadilly one day, I was rather startled to see three young women walking just ahead of me clad in khaki colored trousers with jumpers which came just below their waists; little caps of the same material on one side of their heads. They carried ladders over their shoulders and window cleaning cloths hung from their hip pockets. No one noticed them particularly and they went about their business as though women had always been window cleaners in England. And so it is everywhere. No complaining because of hardship. Everyone glad and ready to do her bit.

To handle the distribution of women's labor several agencies have been established by women's organizations, in addition to the local labor agencies, under the Women's Section of the Board of Trade. At the outbreak of the war England had no registry of women and there has been much maladjustment of labor, much confustion, in locating women where their services would be of the greatest value. Such a registry has, however, been compiled since war was declared. Training classes have been started by several organizations to fit women for the industries open to women for the first time. The Board of Trade has also interested several of the owners of large industries to open their factories in the evening for training classes. The Trades Unions have co-operated in making it possible for women to go into trades hitherto open only to men. Union hours and other union regulations have been set aside until after the war. And so, women are carrying in a very large measure the industrial work of England to-day, and England's export trade has reached its highest point during the war.

The great handicap of many thousand women who volunteered their services for nursing, for industrial, for social or for welfare work when war was declared, was lack of training and experience. Almost simultaneously with the mobilization of the army came the mobilization of the nursing service in England. Hundreds of women who volunteered for this service, but who were rejected because of lack of training, went to France, hoping that, because of the great demand there for nurses, their services might be accepted. But later these women returned to England

to take up whatever work might be open to them. Again and again women said to me: "If only I had taken up some kind of definite training before the war, I could have been of so much greater service now."

When war was declared, England had 23 territorial hospitals equipped with 11,000 beds. Within one week these hospitals were ready to receive the wounded; within eight months the capacity of these 23 hospitals had been increased to 32,500 beds; and, in addition, 800 auxiliary hospitals and convalescent homes had sprung up all over England. As a matter of fact there was but one organization in England with organized trained units whose members could be mobilized at once to supplement the work of the professional hospital staff. This organization, The Voluntary Aid Detachments or the V. A. D., as it is always spoken of over there, was organized in 1909 on the basis of a plan developed by Sir Alfred Keogh, the head of the Medical Division of the British Army. During the Boer War the Royal Army Medical Corps was wholly inadequate to handle the work connected with the sick and wounded, and there was tremendous sacrifice of life in consequence. Sir Alfred Keogh realized that there must be a voluntary nursing service, trained in time of peace, to supplement the R. A. M. C. in time of war. The War Office published a document outlining the scheme of organization for Voluntary Aid and in 1909 the work was started. The requirements for organization and training were definite and specific. The scheme provided for annual examinations and annual inspections; and only those members fulfilling these requirements were continued as members of the detachments.

For five years the members of the V. A. D. continued their work, drilling regularly, having regular work in first-aid and home-nursing. For five years they were ridiculed and laughed at by their friends who attached no particular importance to their work—in fact it was treated as a good deal of a joke; but when in 1914 war was declared, the membership of this organization had reached 60,000 and they were the only organization of volunteers which could be immediately mobilized. From this organization the Territorial and Auxiliary Hospitals have been staffed and over 10,000 V. A. D. members are now doing hospital work in England and France. Their work consists in relieving the regular nurses in every possible way. Keeping the wards in order, helping in the care of patients,

cooking, laundry work; anything and everything needing to be done, they do! Railroad canteens, where food and hot drinks are served to the convoys of sick and wounded, are also in charge of V. A. D.'s. What this railroad canteen work means may be realized to some degree by the fact that at the Victoria Cross Station in London during the first four days of December (last month), over 37,500 sick and wounded Tommies were served with sandwiches, hot tea, coffee or cocoa; and this is only one of the many canteens. They are kept open day and night, seven days in the week. The V. A. D. also has its motor school, where candidates for motor ambulance driving must pass a rigid test not only as to skill in driving, but also as to knowledge of the mechanism of the car. Over 250 members of the V. A. D. are now driving motor ambulances in France. Military and civil authorities pay constant tribute to the splendid efficient service of the members of this organization. The work of the V. A. D., however, is limited to work for the sick and wounded.

Hospital Supply Depots, furnishing work for thousands of women, have been opened in all parts of England, Scotland and Wales; and every conceivable article for hospital use and for the men in the trenches is made at these depots.

Social problems such as never before confronted England have had to be met. Think what it meant to have thousands of men in khaki suddenly plunged into a quiet community—men awaiting orders to the front—men surrounded with military glamour. The excitement of it all naturally reacted upon the girls and young women of the community. A Patrol Service was established which resulted in the opening up all over England of Social Clubs—clubs for young men and women where, under proper supervision, wholesome comradeship of the men in khaki and the girls of the community has been made possible. Over 200 such clubs have been established by the National Council of Women Workers. The Y. W. C. A. has also opened many similar clubs; and what two years ago looked like a serious menace, to-day has become a forward step in the social progress of England.

With the erection of new munition plants all over England and the tremendous increase in the number of employees in all of the munition works, housing and feeding were questions of immediate importance. Whole villages have sprung up around the munition plants. Hostels have been erected where rooms may

be secured at a moderate price. Canteens furnishing hot meals have been opened. The Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. have done splendid work in connection with the hostels and the canteens.

Several organizations are training women for army work in order to release men for the front. For instance, a National Signalling Corps is taking up signalling in all of its branches in order to instruct men in the Army. Thus men teachers are being released for the front. The same is true in regard to the military cooks. Women are being trained in army cooking and becoming teachers in army cooking schools, thus releasing men for the front. One organization has nearly 2,000 women members enrolled in army cooking classes. Another branch of the army work in which women are replacing men is in driving army motors. Over 200 women are now driving army motors in England. Still another organization of women, with a membership of over 6,000, is trained for home defense in case it should be necessary for women to be called out in this capacity. Several organizations are training women for agricultural work, and many thousand women are now engaged on the land.

There is no conscription of women in England. This may come. But at present with every demand which arises, whether it be industrial, agricultural, social or military, there is a ready response. And so for the past two years the Woman Power of the country, the paid and the unpaid, the trained and the untrained, has been used in helping to meet England's need. During this time committees have been appointed under various departments of the Government to deal with various phases of woman's work and woman's welfare. Many, very many private organizations, supported by voluntary contributions, have been established. The leaders in England have now come to realize that there must be a Central Woman's Power Board with authority to supervise and direct woman's work and welfare. Under such a Board the Social and Welfare work, the industrial and agricultural work should be standardized. Duplication of work could be minimized. A clearing house regarding women's work could be established. It has been recommended that such a Board be created under the Treasury Department, with experts to standardize the different departments of the work. This was under consideration by the Government when I left

England late in December and the prospect at that time was that such a Board would be created.

I have described to you only in the most general way what women are doing for England in this time of national crisis. But there is the other side of the question—and that is what this crisis is doing for women and for England, and this may be, perhaps, the basis upon which we in America may attempt to enlarge the scope of our work and our vision. At the outbreak of the war, conditions in England were not so unlike the conditions in America to-day. Prosperity and comfort reigned and blinded the eyes of the nation to any possible menace; "class distinction" and class maladjustment were steadily increasing—with an increasing class misunderstanding; materialism was the god worshipped by all classes, to which the spiritual ideals of home, of community, of country were being sacrificed. A state of unpreparedness existed which has cost England a fearful price. But the people of England have not been brought face to face with the fundamental forces of life and death; and in the common sorrow, the common sacrifice, the common suffering, the god of materialism with many old traditions and prejudices, has fallen. A spiritual awakening is sweeping over England, and the demand is coming from the people to the church rather than from the church to the people. National missions, in which Roman Catholics and Protestants are co-operating, have been established all over England. Shrines have been set up before private houses and public buildings where one may stop and say a prayer. In one of the big munitions plants which I visited, where thousands of girls and women are employed, a petition signed by several hundred employes was sent to the lady superintendent, asking if an intercession service for the boys at the front could be held once or twice a week, as they had no time to go to church. And so on Tuesdays and Fridays of each week a fifteen minute service is held at luncheon time in the Canteen and prayers are said for the boys at the front. With this spiritual awakening and with the service of all men and women in the common cause—"class distinction" has disappeared and an understanding of real values has been developed, which will mean a more equitable adjustment of conditions in England after the war is over than ever could be hoped for without this kind of understanding, which can only come through personal contact in common service.

Another thing which the war is doing for England is giving to men, as well as to women, an appreciation of the resources of women. Old prejudices are going. A striking illustration of this is: Women doctors in England have always had to fight the prejudice against women practicing medicine—nursing was considered womanly, but practicing medicine was not. The War Office of England has entirely staffed one of its large military hospitals in London—the Endel Street Hospital—with women—women surgeons, women doctors, nurses, orderlies, etc. The only men in the hospital are the engineer and one or two assistants. This is a hospital of 500 beds, and all of the operations and amputations are performed by women. Another illustration is the progress which has been made by the suffrage movement. At the outbreak of the war the issue of Woman's Suffrage was set aside, and all of the energy which had been devoted to the fight for the ballot was turned to service for England. A Women's Police Corps was organized and in five cities and towns in England, women are now serving on the Police Force. One woman has been placed on the Metropolitan Police Force and is being paid under the regular police rates. In a little over a year of actual service, women have accomplished in this direction what they have argued and fought for for over twenty years. Even the late Premier, Mr. Asquith, who has been one of the strongest opponents of suffrage for women, recently said: "The service which the women of England have rendered to England during the past two years leaves no argument against their having the ballot."

And what of the Woman Power of America? Again and again I have been asked since my return from Europe, "Is there any reason to suppose that the women of America would not rise to the situation as the women of Europe have done should war come upon us?" There can be no doubt about it. The women of America will make their sacrifices—they will carry their share of the burden and the struggle if ever our country should be plunged into the frightful condition into which the countries of Europe have been plunged. They, with the men of America, will then prove to the world that the ideals of America, for which our forefathers fought and died, are still the ideals for which America is willing to fight and to sacrifice. But must we wait until war comes upon us to demonstrate all this. Are we women, as individuals and as groups or organizations of

women, contributing to our homes, to our community, to our Country the best we have to give? Where can the spiritual ideals, the patriotic ideals of the Nation be nurtured and developed if not in the home? If the spiritual ideals of America are being sacrificed to Materialism, how far are the women of America responsible? How far is the organization work of women in America promoting real democracy? How far is the organization work which is being done bringing about class understanding, and an equitable adjustment of conditions? How can the Resources of Women be used efficiently without co-ordination of interests? Are we, with the multiplicity of organizations of women now existing, developing a national spirit of service? Or are the many different groups, working each on its own program without regard to the rest, making a national spirit of service impossible? Is it not possible for the women of America, now interested in "preparedness" and "patriotic" work, to get together and evolve the best from all of the organizations together; and add to the program whatever we may be able to learn from the experience of women in Europe? Is it not possible for the Women of America to secure some kind of Governmental recognition of what the Woman Power of the country means to the life of our Nation? The female popula tion of this country is nearly fifty million, and there is not in our Government so much as one Bureau devoted to the interests of women. Is it not possible, with the co-operation of women throughout the country, to secure not only a Federal Women's Bureau, but also a Women's Bureau in every state? Is it not possible to have a Government registry of every woman in the country between the ages of eighteen and fifty, which would make possible the intelligent distribution of the Woman Power of the country in time of industrial disorder, or in time of war?

A program for co-ordinating the Woman Power of this country will be presented at the Woman's Session of this Congress. In general this program includes woman's interests, in the home, in the community, for the Nation and for Humanity—classified under National Divisions; organization of Local Detachments under one or another of the National Divisions. The basis of work for all Detachments to be drilling for the development of self-control, discipline, group spirit, etc. Each Detachment under a National Division to meet requirements outlined for the Division. All Detachments to be kept up to a National standard

through inspections and examinations. Annual Encampments to be held in every State or District. Government recognition of Woman Power of the country to be secured, if possible, through a Federal Woman's Bureau and State Bureaus. Registry of women under State Labor Departments to be recommended.

It is a plan based upon the present needs of the country, which will also provide organized, trained units in time of war, or any other calamity.

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: I am sure we are all indebted to Miss Parker for the splendid illustrations she has given and the views she has so beautifully expressed, as demonstrating the power of a woman in the Nation.

One of the speakers on the program for this morning we were not privileged to hear. We are favored by his presence this afternoon, and I will take the liberty of varying the program at this point to introduce to you the distinguished author, Mr. Hermann Hagedorn, Jr., who will address us on the subject of "The Spirit of Preparedness." (Applause.)

THE SPIRIT OF PREPAREDNESS

Address by Hermann Hagedorn of Fairfield, Conn.

The world has amazingly changed during the past two and a half years. Hopes, dreams, theories have been shot to pieces together with impregnable fortresses and unconquerable armies. We, in America, felt happily secure from Europe's quarrels. The problems of Europe had for most of us only the objective interest of matrimonial troubles in the house next door. We thought we were living in the centre of a fairy ring guarded by beneficent spirits who thrust back all who ventured to invade it. We do not think that any more. We have discovered that the chalkline we drew about America did not have the magic qualities we thought it had. The protecting fairies were an illusion. War has stepped into our ring, laughing at our fancies; and slapped us in the face. When Europe is at peace again, there will not be two worlds—an Old World and a New World. There will be one or the other. There will be either an Old World tottering into decrepitude and the grave because it is too tired to see new visions; or a New World, chastened, made strong by discipline, eager for a new light and following the

light into fresh fields. One or the other! And it is the irony of life, that we, America, who hugged our isolation about us as though it were a magic overcoat; it is a curious trick of destiny, that we should be the nation on whom may rest the responsibility of deciding whether the world that emerges from the Great War shall be the Old World or a world new-born—a reprobate spruced up with drugs to stagger along his old boulevards for a season; or an awakened spirit who has put off the old man with his deeds and set his face toward a new life. On us, America, may rest the responsibility of fixing the trend of centuries. The youth of Europe is bleeding to death. In twenty years there may prove to be a tragic lack of leaders in Europe, because Europe's potential leaders died as boys in the trenches in Belgium and France and East Prussia and Galicia. Who can tell what potential Washingtons and Lincolns in Germany, England, France, Russia have fallen with their vision unexpressed? America has not yet been called upon to give up its youth to the sword. But because this service has not been required of us, we must consider with all earnestness what America can do to furnish out of the abundance of its vigorous boys and girls that world leadership in art, in science, in business, but particularly in political thinking, which Europe may well be too crippled, too destitute of splendid youth to supply.

Never in recorded history I believe has so magnificent an opportunity for service and the achievement of pure glory so clearly presented itself to a great nation. The old order is crashing itself to splinters on the battlefields of Europe. On whom, if not on us, who have been spared the physical sacrifice, rests the responsibility of devising and creating the new order? Emphatically we must have armies. Emphatically we must have armament. But as we work for these things it is essential that we keep in the forefront of our minds the realization that humanity demands of us a new solution of the problem of international disputes, less inefficient, less stupid, less brutal than war. Let us arm, by all means, since the world seems able to think and argue on no other terms. But as we arm, as, in this, we follow the example of Europe, let us make sure that we do more than merely imitate the tragic folly of the European nations during the decades immediately preceding the war, entering upon a contest in armaments of which no one can see the outcome. We cannot be so tragically stupid. The calling of this Congress of

Constructive Patriotism means, I believe, that America is ready to inject a new idea into the problem of national defense. For our true national security, for the security of civilization, indeed, it is essential that we do so. America must recognize at the outset as the leaders of the National Security League so clearly recognize, that armies and navies by themselves do not constitute defense at all; they constitute only new and perilous problems. We cannot, in the face of the European cataclysm, accept military armament as anything but a stop-gap for the moment. We must not give life and perpetuity in this country to the idea that the strength of a nation depends on the size of its armies and its guns. That way madness lies. Our only hope of security rests in our recognition of the fact that, as we are building up our army and our navy, we must with equal vigor and enthusiasm build up an alert and conscientious citizenship to control that army and that navy. Into the old dough we must inject the leaven of democracy.

We owe it to the American tradition to do this; we owe it to all the men and women and children of Europe who lie stricken as a consequence of a piling up of armaments ostensibly to preserve peace; we owe it to the toilers for liberty and progress who the world over look to America for inspiration and leadership, to transfuse the old idea of national defense with a new vision. Most of all, we owe this to the youth of our own land. Not we who here talk of armies and armament will be the ones to suffer most from their use or their abuse. We can begin wars. The boys of eighteen and nineteen must carry them on whether they want to or not, and end victoriously what their elders stupidly began. We must arm, but as we arm, let us consider youth.

I said, "Into the old dough we must inject the leaven of democracy." Why? Because we like the word, because it sounds sweet to our ears, because it sounds noble and fine? No! But because unjust wars are made by kings or by cliques, either of nobles, politicians or plutocrats—never by Smith and Jones and Robinson. Smith and Jones and Robinson don't gain anything by the annexation of Timbuctoo. They lose. Their gains, spiritual and material, come from friendly rivalry with other nations, never from war. Annex creation, and Smith and Jones and Robinson are still the losers. Aggression helps kings and cliques, never the people. Kings, let us pray, will not bother us much longer. Whatever the news is from the trenches, ladies

and gentlemen, the news from the hearths and homes in Europe is that humanity at last has kings on the run! Cliques next! Cabals next, whether of princes or plutocrats! Men and women in the great republics must begin at last to govern themselves.

The men of high vision who have given their hearts and hands to the work of the National Security League, have, as I said, long recognized the importance of these matters, which I propound as solemnly as though I imagined myself their discoverer. I do not pretend to be anything but their megaphone. I am fully conscious that all that I am saying is familiar platitude to the leaders of the National Security League. I wish it were a platitude to all the world. But it is not. Perhaps, it is not a platitude even to all of you, that force must be the servant of spirit or it will be the master of spirit. There can be no partnership there. Force is master or spirit is master. The leaders of the National Security League, who have devised such magnificent plans for the education of the American citizenry, know that better than I. I presume to speak of it only because I believe that this idea demands a stronger emphasis than has hitherto been put upon it. I believe that the majority of those who support military preparedness in this country do not yet recognize that a military establishment is a real safeguard only when it has an alert democracy behind it.

I believe, in fact, that it never occurs to that majority that there might be perils connected with a great military establishment. I am amazed at the war of applause that greets every mention of compulsory military service. I believe in compulsory military service, but I do not want to clap my hands when the subject is mentioned. I want to go into the wilderness—and think. It is a subject that demands all the clear thinking we can possibly give it. To say that compulsory military service is a success in Norway, Sweden, Argentine, Australia and Switzerland, and that therefore it will necessarily be a success in the United States is not logic. It is lunacy. Compared to such sentimentalism that dream of the million men rising up at the President's call between dayrise and dayfall appears like grim realism. The pacifists are not the only sentimentalists. We have no sentimentalists more dangerous to our institutions than those who, while advocating a military establishment we know is necessary, ignore the perils that we know, also, invariably accompany a great military establishment in any nation that is a world

power. If you are not satisfied with the example of Germany because it is a monarchy, look at the army scandals which came within an ace of disrupting France twenty years ago. The trouble is that we are incorrigible Peter Pans in America. We *do* believe in fairies. We scoff at those who will not see the danger from foreign aggression, and, quite as blind as they, fail to heed other perils quite as great.

I desire to develop the idea which Mr. Menken yesterday so stirringly presented because I know that it needs all the emphasis which the thinking minds of this Congress can put upon it. It is a fad to talk about military preparedness, and I am glad that it is. But it is not a fad to talk about the matters Mr. Menken talked of yesterday. It is not a fad to talk about citizenship. Turn to this morning's issue of the Washington "Post." You will see in it that Mr. Menken talked of munitions and fortifications and the navy, but of Mr. Menken's constructive program for the awakening of the American people to some sense of individual responsibility you will find not a single word. I appeal to you! Are we so deafened by the roar of guns that we have no ear for constructive idealism expressed in terms of schools and the ballot? The way in which the morning paper ignored Mr. Menken's proposals is to me the first convincing proof that America was getting old and mentally impotent. You remember that walking form in Polonias. He must have a jig or a tale of bawdry, or he sleeps.

I said, and I shall say it again: I believe that the majority of those who support military preparedness in this country do not yet recognize that a military establishment is a real safeguard only when it has an alert democracy behind it. I believe, moreover, that the pacifists main distinction is that they fear their own countrymen—notably us of the Security League—more than they fear either Europe or Asia. I believe that the pacifists do not realize that the National Security League has itself recognized the perils a military establishment involves, and is already planning to meet these perils and remove them by working for an enlightened citizenship. It seems to me of the utmost importance that the attention of the country should be focussed upon this supremely significant point of the program of the National Security League. In it, if the country will only recognize it, lies America's original contribution to the problem of National Defense and the problem of ending wars. Utterly un-

known to you as I am, a kid in the council-room, I presume to engage your time because of my profound and unshakeable conviction that, in the education of girls and boys in matters pertaining to citizenship and, more important still, in the stimulation in girls and boys of a sense of responsibility of each for all, of a sense of public service, lies a hope, lies the only hope of making an end of wars. The National Security League has expressed a saving idea. I beg that the light be focussed upon it. The world should know that America is looking forward, not back!

We wish to arm America, saying we arm for peace. Unless we say more, what sardonic laughter from oversea must greet that utterance! Europe was never arming for anything but peace. We can arm truly for peace only if behind our outer rampart of ships and armies we build an inner wall of enlightened and vigorous citizenship. There will be wars in Europe until the nations of Europe achieve that enlightened citizenship, and there will be wars here until we achieve it. Leagues to Enforce Peace are a tragic joke without it. World courts are an old maid's dream without it. We must arm. We must arm with ships and guns like the rest. But as we arm, let us send this trumpet-call to a world in agony: "America arms, but she does more. America teaches her citizens how to use their strength. America teaches her children citizenship. After a hundred and forty years America has decided at last to take democracy seriously!"

I am not joking. When, indeed, has America taken democracy seriously? When has she tried to train her citizens to use wisely the power she has so liberally bestowed? What school or college has in its curriculum emphasized the prime importance of citizenship? An occasional course in civics, dry and lifeless, an occasional dab at current events as innocent of correlation and any stress on currents and tendencies as a yellow journal scarehead; for history, an accumulation of pleasant legends, unpatriotic because largely untrue; some talk about the flag; much to puff up our chests; little or nothing to make us conscious of our individual responsibility toward our fellows and toward the nation, and beyond the nation, toward the splendid experiment in democracy that America represents—so far and no farther have our secondary schools gone in their recognition of the importance of citizenship. The colleges teach government and

history, but the courses are optional. No word in their catalogues suggests that a patriotic citizen will apply himself to these subjects. Physics may be compulsory and Latin or German or French may be compulsory, for those constitute culture; but never by any chance the subjects that constitute the background for good citizenship. How ludicrous, when our lives, our institutions, all our fine ideals, may depend on our ability to deal critically and justly with the hundred matters that come before us as citizens between November and November, that our schools and colleges do nothing whatsoever to give us a definite background for judgment or even to create a tradition of clean and wideawake citizenship! A tradition of clean athletics, yes. A man must not play summer baseball, he must not slug, he must not break training. A tradition of college spirit, also. A man must come out for the team, he must do something—sing, write, row, tinkle the banjo—or he will lose caste and will not be elected to Bones or the Pudding. He must play square by his team, his class, his college. But he need not play square by his city, his state or his nation. He may howl for the police and the police will help him and the courts will protect him and ambassadors will stand on their heads and guns roar and boys from Kansas and Maine die for his confounded oilfields, but he need not vote, he need not even do a minute's thinking in payment for all that he receives. His only relation to his government may be the relation of the boot to the object that offends it. But no one blames him. Not even the colleges. On the contrary, they give him degrees. Unlike the college boy who prefers to stay away from baseball games, the citizen who prefers to stay away from the polls does not lose caste. No one has been taught to see him for the contemptible shirker that he is. The colleges have their girls and boys four years. They have time to talk of Aspasia and Orlando Furioso and Oscar Wilde and the authorship of the Pervirgilium Veneris, all the silly frumpery of a sham culture and a shallow scholarship. But for the elements of ordinary citizenship they have neither time nor attention. Democracy asks bread of them and they give it a rhinestone. During the past fortnight I have talked to undergraduates in a half dozen or more of the greatest universities in the East and Middle West. In each and all it was the same story—a president detached for the student body, great dignity, great administrative ability—but no leadership. "You can't get under-

graduates here interested in national affairs," said the editor of the daily paper of one of the greatest universities in the United States—not, by the way, Yale or Harvard or Princeton. "They are absolutely indifferent!" Is that not a heaven-screaming indictment of that university's president and faculty? That university has wonderful buildings, but what are those buildings but slaughter-houses of souls and tombs for the burial of souls, if the eager spirits that go in come out of them *indifferent*—that was the word— *indifferent to national* affairs? Indifferent! Indifferent, whether America do her duty; indifferent whether America stand firmly for law, for the rights of her citizens and the rights of outraged humankind; indifferent whether America drift toward disaster, moral and physical; indifferent whether there be any America at all in the counsels of the world! Indifferent to national affairs! In times like these it is treason to be indifferent!

There was only one university in which the undergraduate leaders admitted their college-mates to be indifferent. In the others, there was a spark of concern for the welfare of the nation, and more than a spark in some, needing only a blower for the kindling of bright fires. But the colleges have no blowers—of that sort. There is plenty of wind, but no concentration. There is general talk enough of ideals and service—the sermons and the addresses by prominent citizens are full of general uplift, but there is little or no attempt to point specifically to opportunities, and to insist on the necessity of service. There is no leadership. It is shameful and tragic that this should be so. There are thousands and thousands of wonderful girls and boys who go from school to college every year full of the longing to be defenders of great causes. But the longing remains unsatisfied, the longing dies, and the girl or boy who might have made a great citizen becomes one of the cynical, indifferent crowd, because no one has called into service the unselfish and idealistic impulses. The spirit dies within them because there is no leadership. The president of the university is too busy collecting funds for new buildings to care whether the spirit of that girl or that boy, and of thousands of girls and boys like them, flourishes or rots, lives or dies. Why must so many of our college presidents be ambulatory cash-registers? Why must those who are supposed to guide the youth of the country have frequently no gift save the fatal gift of turning to stone every-

thing they touch? Why must they scurry about after new buildings and leave all the aspiring toward public service, all the arguing about democracy, to a handful of unguided sophomores about an open fire, eager spirits, half ashamed of themselves for discussing matters dismissed alike by faculty and student-body as remote from college business? Why do we totally ignore in our institutions of learning the one profession which every American youth over twenty-one must embrace—the profession of citizenship? Why do we do nothing whatever of a practical nature to instil in him some idea of the meaning of citizenship, some knowledge that will help him to think intelligently of national affairs, and to vote wisely, some tradition of public service, some sense of responsibility? We have time enough during those four years to teach the history of Etruscan art and to give courses on the letter-writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Truly, we are fools, chasing butterflies at the edge of an abyss, fiddling our little fiddle-dee-dee about culture while Rome burns. Who gives a hang who wrote the Pervigilium Veneris or who made love to Mary Wortley Montagu? To-morrow, we may have leisure again to consider those matters. To-day, it is a mockery of dead men to waste intelligence and time upon them to the exclusion of citizenship. To-day, education in school or college can have only one aim—the fashioning of minds to grapple with the problem of achieving democracy, which is the problem of ending wars. An education which, to all practical purposes, ignores citizenship is a fraud We must begin to give less time to the shabby veneer of culture, and more to the requirements of plain citizenship, or some one. some fine day, will add another dead language to the curriculum and that language will be English. I hold no brief for a merely utilitarian education. Good citizenship is not a utilitarian end. Good citizenship is a sacred duty. It is the first duty of every man, educated or uneducated, a duty to himself, to his family, to his country, to humanity. For, I reiterate, alert and conscientious citizenship—the sense of responsibility of each for all—is the only safeguard against national disaster. If America is to endure as a nation based broadly on the principles of democracy, she must begin soon to educate her girls and boys—not a chosen few, but *all* her girls and boys—honestly and persistently in those matters that pertain to good citizenship; in

government, in contemporary world history and politics, and in the fundamentals of those local and national problems which those girls and boys will have to face when they become voters. If Latin or Greek or French or German or Paradise Lost or Macbeth or Macaulay's essay on somebody or other, get in the way of this work they will have to be flung aside. America First! If that is materialism, I am ready to be boiled in oil as a materialist. But I believe profoundly that if you awaken in a girl or boy the spirit of service and an ideal of citizenship, that girl or boy will seek and find poetry and art and music without prodding. Service is the foundation of true culture. Service first! An infinitely richer culture than we have now will spring from it.

The world to-day looks to America to transform national defense from a treacherous and often sordid problem, fraught with possibilities of utmost disaster, into an inspiring opportunity for democratic service. To-morrow the world will look to America for leaders. What a chance for our schools and colleges! Are they conscious of it? I doubt it. Like Kansas, the schools and colleges are thinking in terms of 1912 and 1913, when they are not thinking in terms of 1892 and 1837. On their awakening depends the future of America. They have their girls and boys during the splendid, impressionable years. They *can* create a tradition of public service. They have it in their power to brand indifference to national affairs the shame and the disgrace that it is. They can arouse in girls and boys a love for the principle of democracy that is the only force that will ever make democracy an achieved success. They can do all these things if they will only wake up to their chance. If they do *not* wake up, if they continue to prefer buildings to souls and administrative efficiency to human leadership, posterity will know whom to blame for the failure of America's democratic experiment. We cannot afford to blink the fact that it is the stupidity of standpat educators that makes wars quite as much as the cupidity of munition manufacturers.

Ladies and gentlemen, as America arms, let us help her truly to arm. Ships and guns and soldiers, yes. But behind that arming, in every home, in every church, in every school, in every college and university from coast to coast, a mental arming, a moral arming, an arming of the spirit! We cannot affront

mankind, we cannot betray our own posterity, by putting our trust in physical force alone. The world looks to us to contribute a new idea to the problem of national defense: Armies and armament and soldiers trained to fight, but, behind all that, girls and boys, women and men, trained with equal thoroughness to govern, and stimulated to serve. In a more perfect democracy lies the only hope of ending the base stupidity of wars. Let America go to it! She has a dazzling opportunity!

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: Ladies and Gentlemen, I have an announcement in further variation of the program. Mr. Medill McCormick, whose subject was "The Need of Governmental Efficiency," will speak this evening at the D. A. R. Hall.

Governor Edge is unable to be present this afternoon, and I am requested to announce that the paper on "The State Budget System," prepared by Governor Edge of New Jersey will be presented by title and made a part of the proceedings. Governor Edge would have been here yesterday, but inasmuch as the subject to which he was assigned was made a part of to-day's program, he contributes his address and regrets that it is impossible for him to be here.

THE STATE BUDGET SYSTEM

A Paper Prepared by Hon. Walter E. Edge, Governor of New Jersey

The financial system is the lock on the door that leads to business-like government. The Executive Budget is the key that fits the lock and will open it. Therefore, the "State Executive Budget," which I have been invited to discuss to-day, is a factor of prime importance in progressing toward sound government. It insures a working acquaintanceship between the Governor and every branch of the government requiring appropriations—a familiarity which would never obtain were it not for the Budget responsibility which the Governor is obliged to assume. Hence, the State, through the Budget, gets the advantage, which every successful private corporation enjoys of having its money expended by someone who is familiar with its financial needs and its everyday business.

The ordinary system of fixing appropriations is vicious and unsound for three reasons: First, it mixes politics too much with our public finances; second, it fails to concentrate responsibility; and, third, it does not regard the important relationship between income and expenses, between revenues and appropriations.

Everyone is familiar with the fact that legislators are intent upon obtaining appropriations to please the particular county or district they represent. It is natural that some of them should care very little whether the State has sufficient income to meet its expenses or whether some other county or district receives its share of the State money, just so long as they get theirs. In some counties, perhaps, the statesmanship and ability of a legislator are gauged by the amount of appropriations which he is able to squeeze out of the State money bag for institutions, organizations and improvements of his own county; if he fails to measure up to the expectations of his constituents in this respect he is a political failure and frequently finds that the lame-duck club is waiting to initiate him. I submit that the legislator ought to be protected against this baneful political pressure. The policy of grabbing from the public strong-box as much as it will stand, and more, for the benefit of constituents, is distasteful to the average legislator. He "follows precedent" from necessity rather than choice. He would rather not be bothered with the unpleasant task of satisfying district greed and be free to devote his legislative time to the many problems of genuine statesmanship. The Budget provides him the opportunity by relieving him of much of the responsibility of "local financing."

In New Jersey control of the finances of the State is not centralized wholly in the Chief Executive. The Legislators bear their share of the responsibility, after the Governor has carefully investigated the requisitions of the different departments, commissions and other State agencies and transmitted them to the Legislature with certain specific recommendations, based on the principle that at no time shall the appropriations exceed the income of the State. But New Jersey has gone as far as it could to concentrate responsibility in the Executive and to eliminate politics from State financing without altering the constitution.

Our Budget plan is authorized merely by law. I shall outline it as briefly as I may.

Each department of the State Government, board, commission, charitable or correctional institution, or any other State agency, requiring an annual appropriation in the State, presents a request therefor to the Governor on or before November 15th of each year. Any organization, body, committee or person intending to request an appropriation from the Legislature for any particular object or purpose or for any new annual expenditure, likewise presents such request to the Governor on or before November 15th.

All such requests for appropriations must show in detail the purposes for which appropriations are requested, and where increases or decreases from previous appropriations are desired, the reason therefor. Such requests must be sworn to by the person making the same.

There must accompany such requests for appropriations a trial balance covering the preceding fiscal year, showing the receipts and expenditures of the department or body presenting such requests in such form and detail as the Governor may direct.

On November 15th of each year, and thereafter as required, the Comptroller and State Treasurer must jointly transmit to the Governor, in such form as he shall direct, a summary of the financial condition of the State. This report must show in condensed form, the financial condition of the State for the fiscal year ending October 31st preceding, in New Jersey, the amounts expended and the amounts received, the sources and amounts of income, and the free balance in the treasury. They must also furnish similar information, as nearly as the same can be ascertained, for the current year. The report must likewise show the probable source of revenue and the probable estimate of the State's income available for appropriations for the next fiscal year for which the legislature will be requested to make appropriations.

Upon the receipt of requests for appropriations and the report of the Treasurer and Comptroller, the Governor proceeds to examine such requests and report for the purpose of determining the necessity of the appropriations so requested, and, in a

separate message, transmits to the legislature on the second Tuesday in January, a summary of such requests and report, together with his recommendations thereon.

For the purpose of investigating the necessity of the appropriations so requested or for the purpose of ascertaining if either new sources of income are required or present sources of income are properly collected or for any similar purpose, at any time, the Governor may summon witnesses and conduct hearings or appoint any officer of the State Government or any other person particularly fitted therefor to conduct any investigation or examination necessary to aid him in this purpose.

The message of the Governor is required to be in such form that it can be easily understood by the average citizen. It is required to be printed and a copy thereof presented to each member of the Legislature, the press, each public library and to be given such other publicity as the Governor or Joint Appropriations Committee may deem wise.

The Governor is prohibited from recommending to the Legislature appropriations in excess of the anticipated revenue. Should the Governor believe that additional appropriations are necessary, he is required, if he deem it advisable, to suggest plans for raising sufficient revenue to meet such appropriations.

If he deems it necessary, the Governor may, from time to time, transmit special messages requesting additional appropriations for purposes not anticipated at the time the budget message was transmitted to the Legislature.

No money may be drawn from the treasury except by the general appropriation bill, and it is the expressed intent of our act that no supplemental, deficiency or incidental bill shall be considered.

Prior to the enactment of the Budget Act in New Jersey requests for appropriations were considered by the Appropriations Committee of the Legislature. While this Committee held sessions and did not work deliberately in secret, as may be supposed, few legislators outside of the nine members of the Committee knew anything at all concerning the requests for appropriations during the time that they were being considered by the Committee. The public and the press knew absolutely nothing about them. Not until the final week of the session, when the recommended appropriations were hurriedly thrown

together into a bill and introduced in the House, did the majority of legislators and the public have any knowledge of what the requisitions were. As a result the appropriations bill was rushed through and passed in the final hours of the sessions with only nine of the eighty-one members of the Legislature having any extensive knowledge of what the bill contained. Of course, the political boodler and the State money-bag grabber were in clover with such a systemless proceeding. Appropriations frequently exceeded the revenues of the State deficits in the treasury, calling for extraordinary measures to create new sources of revenue, were common.

Under the Budget Act which I have outlined, these loose methods were superseded by a businesslike system. Instead of a committee receiving the requisitions during a busy legislative session with little or no opportunity to investigate their justness, the requested requisitions must be in the hands of the Governor by November 15th, two months before the Legislature in New Jersey convenes, and he has this time to conduct a painstaking investigation. Instead of legislators seeing the recommended appropriations during the last week or day of a legislative session they see them on the first day in the form of a printed message from the Governor, together with his recommendations and a report showing the financial condition of the State and the estimated revenue for the coming fiscal year. Instead of the appropriations exceeding the revenues, the law expressly provides that they shall not be in excess of the known income of the State. Naturally, the responsibility under this system largely falls on the Governor, but I conceive this to be entirely proper. Responsibility for the financing of a State must be concentrated somewhere if results are to be secured, and the people more and more are coming to look to the Governor as personally responsible for the success or failure of his administration.

In Maryland, under a constitutional amendment, they have gone somewhat farther with the Executive Budget System. In that State, for instance, the General Assembly may increase or diminish the items relating to the General Assembly and may increase, but not decrease, the items therein relating to the Judiciary, but in all other respects the Legislature cannot increase any items of appropriation, but may strike out or decrease, with one exception, and that is they cannot decrease the salary

of a public official during his term of office. In New Jersey, without a constitutional amendment which was deemed inadvisable because of the difficulty and time required to alter the organic law, the legislators still have a voice in finally fixing the appropriations. Their power to increase or decrease the items, with perhaps some minor exceptions, could not be abridged. But I take it that the most glaring defects of the former financial system were cured when the legislators had the requisitions investigated for them and presented to them on the opening day of the session in which they were to be acted upon. The average legislator may be trusted to do his full duty, especially when he has the benefit of Executive investigation and advice and the opportunity to acquaint himself at leisure with the contents of an appropriation measure. I confidently believe this will be proved by the way the Budget Act works out in actual practice in New Jersey.

I am not discussing a National Budget, but I cannot refrain from suggesting that if the fundamental principles of the State Budget were applied by Congress the effect on our national financing would be revolutionary and wonderfully satisfactory. "Budget" is the antidote of "Pork" and the opportunity for constructive financial reform knocks at the door in Washington just as it knocked at Trenton and Annapolis.

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: The next address, which will conclude the afternoon's program, I am sure you will be glad if you remain to hear. The question of the cost of government is a very important question. The taxpayers of this country are beginning to realize it now, and they will begin to realize it more and more, in spite of all, I believe, that can be done. It involves the whole organization of public authority. The departmental estimates, as you know, are made up annually, for the expenditures of the Government are not criticised or supervised or co-ordinated into one general scheme by any central authority. Each department makes up its own estimate, without regard to the whole expenditure of the Government.

The next speaker on the program will discuss the question of a National Budget System. It is now my pleasure and honor to present to you the former Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the Hon. Charles Nagel. (Applause.)

A NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM

Hon. Charles Nagel of St. Louis, former Secretary of Commerce and Labor

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: When I saw my name coupled with the subject, "A National Budget System," I wondered just what the framer of the program had in mind. Upon reflection, I have concluded that it was the purpose to give a living example of a citizen of the United States who had presided over one of the great departments of the Government and who had never come within gunshot of a budget.

It has been said of Mr. Gladstone that one speech upon the budget elevated him to the position of a great statesman. It was said afterwards that he, of all men, was able to lead his hearers over the arid deserts of figures without ever for a moment losing their interest in the discussion. We may ask ourselves why it is that no statesman of the United States, with all our ability and all our oratory, has ever been able to present a budget so as to give the people an understanding of our resources, and to impress them with the need for a more intelligent employment of our economic power. The explanation is simple. We have not the forum. Our system is not arranged either for the making of a budget, for the presentation of a budget, or for the responsible defense of a budget by any one who undertakes to speak in the name of the administration in power.

As the chairman has said, every secretary prepares his estimates. If the President is very exacting, he may have those estimates submitted and discussed in the Cabinet, in order to impress some kind of system upon the plans. But when they leave the hands of the secretaries, they are subject to the discretion of Congress; and from that time on they are at the mercy of a conflict between legislative and executive authority.

In England, when a minister presents his budget, it is the result of a conference of the entire Cabinet. He stands upon the floor of Parliament; he has the privilege to explain that budget; he has the right to reply to an attack, and if he is not sustained he knows, and the members of Parliament know, that a dissolution may result, and that the eloquence of a Gladstone may defend that budget before the constitutents.

Not so here. If the estimates are not accepted, there is no one to take exception; unless at some later election, with a lot of other important questions intervening, the people should remember that a consecutive and consistent plan submitted by the Executive was not carried into operation by the legislative body.

This is the situation to-day in this country. How are we going to remedy it? We are bound to do it some time; and we have presented to us in this respect precisely the same question that we have presented with respect to military and naval preparedness. Shall we wait for necessity; or shall we have the intelligence to anticipate the coming storm? That is the question before the American people in every respect, with reference to every important question that has been under discussion here during these days. We have a way of adjusting our system to the needs of our times; but we can not deny that at the present time nearly all our legislation is had under pressure of necessity.

There is no program which anticipates what is coming, which husbands our strength and devotes it most intelligently and advantageously to coming needs. Look at the laws that have been enacted—I do not think of this administration any more than of others—and ask yourselves whether, in every instance, we were not driven to do what we did because we had not seen the storm gathering on the horizon.

Of course, in case of an emergency, we will adapt our system to necessity. But that is merely a temporary relief. If we want really to be ready, and use our material force, then we must have a plan which prepares in advance; under which we may make preparation in every phase, military, industrial and social, for the responsibilities that undoubtedly will come to us in due time.

We may ask ourselves what the budget has to do with the scheme that is under discussion here to-day. I answer that it is the cornerstone of the whole plan of preparedness. It means conservation; it means an intelligent selection of the tax scheme, and an equally intelligent application of the revenue. It means to do what Gladstone did, which is to show the relation between the source and the employment of the revenue, so as to make it attractive, and to make people see that when they are carrying the burden there is promise of a corresponding return for it.

What do we do? When we suggest an appropriation, do we ask how it is to be secured? No; we simply inquire whether it

may not be possible to put some other tax on corporations or some other interest that is equally handy. There is no continuing relation between the source of the income and the application of the revenue.

However, that is only one phase of preparedness. When we speak of military preparedness, every one here is in accord; but I do not think that any one ought to be asked to speak before this Congress without at least accepting the opportunity to say where he stands upon that question. (Applause.) I am for military preparedness because I see the illustration before me; but I have favored military training for years, because I believed that its moral value has been underestimated.

It is not only the force of the army and navy; it is the discipline of the man. It is the self-imposed discipline of a free people upon itself. It stands for the only true democracy there is. It must be understood that in war and in peace every citizen is prepared to serve at the call of his country. (Applause.) Years ago I used to say—and I relied largely upon English books—that it is a mistake to say that the army is the source of undivided expense. In my judgment, the saving by discipline in army and navy training, has never been properly appreciated. Look at our country. I have said, "give me the right in our cities and our towns to take the dudes and 'toughs' and drill them every morning, and I will make men out of half of them." (Applause.)

That is our problem. I speak of the rich as I do of the poor. You know that fathers and mothers in this country who are honest with themselves know that their chief care is how to protect their children against too much protection. That is their concern. We suffer from too much coddling. I am willing to look to the countries that have known how to protect their people without coddling them. We have something to learn.

But for military reasons I am for preparedness, because I think we are not alive to our own position. If we imagine that we can go on taking a decided position in the affairs of the world, and still enjoy sweet immunity without interference from abroad, I think we make a mistake. If we are not prepared we will invite the very danger that we are hoping to avoid. (Applause.) That applies to the army and that applies to the navy. If however, we have universal training of men and women, as we should

have, there is no danger of hasty war; because that training gives just taste enough to have no one wish for an unnecessary war. (Applause.) On the other hand, it will give preparation enough to make every one feel that we need not fear a necessary war. (Applause.) In other words, it will give us the real idea of an American citizen's responsibility. Uniforms and guns we may supply in an emergency. What we need prepare is shoulders to bear them, and a spirit to honor them. No compulsory system can alone protect us. It needs the volunteer enthusiasm to give it life and power.

The army and navy alone do not suffice. These are nothing but the arrow; the driving power is the industrial and the social system. In my judgment, we are not thinking enough of preparedness in the industrial and social field. Look at other countries, and see with what a divided, self-conflicting proposition we have to deal here. We have national and international commerce. Of course we have; but we have no national corporations. We are afraid of ourselves. We want these things and we fear them. We talk about having corporations combined for foreign trade, and we are afraid to have large concerns for the trade in our own country. We shall have to do what England has done, and what Germany has done. It makes no difference by what name it is called, we shall have organizations that are big enough to attend to interstate and international commerce at the same time, and that will not be enemies of the government. (Applause.) That is our need. (Applause.)

What is the use of having an army and a navy, if you have nothing to fight for? What is the use of having either, if they are not sustained? What is the sense of contemplating without coming to a conclusion? Recall the picture we witnessed last year, when our troops were sent down to the border on some of our railroads, and then some of them had to come back to make sure that the railroads would continue to run. (Laughter.) Was not that a spectacle of preparedness? But that is only an illustration of the conditions with which we have to deal.

It is so with social preparedness. We hardly know how to define it, or what we mean. We have a problem that is entirely new. We may learn much by looking to other countries; but with us the social problem involves the man, woman and child, and therefore belongs particularly to the regulation of the indi-

vidual states. And many of our individual states are far behind in that respect.

I read in Dawson's books—an Englishman—that he ascribes the strength of Germany to-day to the perfection of her local self-government. Where is our local self-government? We have hardly learned the first lesson. Call a child an individualist or a socialist, as you please; a child is an asset to the state, and it ought to be the concern of authority to get that child on the credit side, and not on the debit side of the ledger. (Loud applause.) How many superintendents of our institutions, from penitentiaries down or up, have the subject in mind? How many institutions are there that take helpless children, the victims of fate and misfortune, and really give them the protection which the state alone can provide? Private charity we look to. We have as many systems as we have names; we spend money enough to protect everybody; but there is no preparedness and no organization in the private systems. Praise them, yes; I think the spirit is wonderful. But it is energy and money and good will fifty per cent. wasted, because we do not realize how much might be done with that which is gladly contributed. As it is, the best of it all is to be found in the hearts and the minds of the women who manage most of these charities. (Applause.)

We cannot continue to place reliance upon so imperfect a plan. I do not derive my inspiration for constructive patriotism from hatred for one country or friendship for another. Our problem is much profounder than that. I am unwilling to help lull my countrymen to sleep, relying upon a friendly power whose navy sweeps the ocean; and I am equally unwilling to go into hysteria because somebody tells me that another friendly power may land its troops upon our shores overnight. It goes deeper than that. The conflict on the other side must, in my judgment, serve as an illustration, but not as a cause, for our preparedness measures. I admit and agree that blood is thicker than water. But when I say that, I mean the red blood of America (Applause) which, I confidently trust, will stand the crucial test of any emergency.

I believe that we ought to prepare socially, industrially and in a military sense, because no man can calculate what we may have to meet in the future. We are bound to say to ourselves that we can not expect to enjoy unbroken immunity. We are

bound to say to ourselves that whether or not we need the power against any foreign nation or combination of nations, we do need it as a matter of self-respect, for the proper bringing up of our citizenship under democratic institutions, and to have them always prepared for any national emergency. And there is a significance in the employment of the word "national." It means that the entire people must co-operate, in obedience to a recognized plan, to sustain the government; and this means that no military plan can be effective unless the authority which is responsible for the safety and honor of the nation, is given the power to call into action a mobilized people.

You ask, "What has that to do with a budget?" I answer that a man who takes stock must not pick out his favorite goods, and judge the rest by them. He must take the whole stock to know where he is, and then he may make his calculation. So we have to take stock of all we have and all we can rely upon; and then we may know what obligations and what promises we may assume. And when we take stock we will have, among other things, to take stock of our own people. It is not purely a material question; but we have other problems in our country that we must keep in mind. I am going to say frankly that I think the most necessary and the absolutely essential asset of the United States is "A united people for preparedness." (Applause.) We must remember that we have been put together as no nation on earth has ever been. No part of our people is a conquered people, compelled to adjust themselves to the conqueror. Our people are here by invitation, and the problem is how we, an amalgamated people that we are, can really rise to the high test of our democratic institutions, far beyond the dream of any nation. That is our problem. It is not a new one; we have faced it often. What little influence I have has been to admonish people that whatever they may think or say they must keep both feet upon the platform of the United States. (Applause.)

I do not quarrel with sympathy; I know there are traditions that are sacred. You cannot kill sympathy by law or by threat; but you may demand that every citizen of the United States will be true to his government when the decision is made. (Applause.) There is no other answer possible. There is nothing new in this. We fought it out when the North and South were opposed

to each other. That was a tragedy. It often meant family against family, brother against brother. In the foreign war now there is not a flag under which Jews do not fight, brother against brother, with scarcely so much hope that when it is all over their fate will be materially improved. Such is our problem. We must be patient with one another. We must forbear, we must respect each other, because after the war we are going to live together, and we will still have these same problems to solve.

Let me remind you that the men who fight on the other side fight with guns, and men who fight with guns always forgive; but men who fight with tongues, as many of us here do, rarely ever forgive; and thus we are in danger of creating a state of discord that may harass us for generations. (Applause.)

It is not a new problem. In the great debate between Douglas and Lincoln the same question was raised, and Lincoln said that we forget that we are a new people; that when the Declaration of Independence was written, all the people who are represented here now were not here; but when these people, the Dutch, the Jew, the Swede, the German, the Irishman, the Scotchman and others came over and read the Declaration of Independence, they had a right to feel that they were blood of the blood and bone of the bone of the men who had written that declaration. (Applause.) Lincoln, by taking that broad position, reaching out for the support of the whole citizenship of the United States, brought to his support every element in the North, without question, without doubt. Later, when Lincoln was challenged by Greeley, and told that he ought to emancipate the slaves, he again recognized union as a paramount issue; first, the union of the people, then the union of the state; and his answer was, that if he could set all the slaves free and save the union, he would do it; if he could set none of them free, he would save the union; and if he could set some free and leave others slaves, he would still save the union. That was the paramount issue.

I say to you that this is the paramount issue in our plans for preparedness to-day. We are a new people, and we are going to have a type of our own. We have it now; you see it in every direction, wherever you look. This audience is an American audience, unlike any audience in the world. Every schoolroom shows it, every courtroom and every factory shows it. When our boys went down to the border they demonstrated it, because

they went from the East and the South and the West and the North and the Middle States, rich and poor, representing all the phases of our citizenship. There they learned to respect each other, and as they come home they will tell you that the patriotism of an American citizen is not to be judged by section or ancestry. (Applause.) When our boys fell in the Mexican encounters, although there were not many, they gave their lives for us. Some of us could not pronounce their names; but we would not on that account deny them the tribute that they died honorably for the United States, under the orders of the Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy. (Applause.)

We are going to have a type of our own. We see it everywhere; and I see it best exemplified, and have for years observed it, in our boys in the army and in the navy. It is a type of its own. There is an attitude of restrained individuality that is American. There is a glance and a poise that is unlike anything else in the world; and when I see it I say, "That is ours; that is our type." Ladies and gentlemen, in my judgment, that is America. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN FLETCHER: As previously announced, Mr. McCormick will be heard at the D. A. R. Hall this evening. Mr. Nagel's splendid address closes the program for the afternoon, and the meeting is adjourned.

FIFTH SESSION

8 P. M., Friday, January 26th, 1917
D. A. R. Memorial Hall

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Henry D. Estabrook, of New York, who introduced the presiding officer.

MR. HENRY D. ESTABROOK: Invocation will be given by Rt. Rev. William T. Russell, D. D., the Bishop of Charleston.

INVOCATION

Rt. Rev. Wm. T. Russell, D. D., Bishop of Charleston

Assist, Oh Lord, our acts by Thy holy inspiration, and carry on, by Thy gracious assistance, this patriotic work of ours, begun through Thee, so that it may by Thee be happily ended, through Christ, our Lord.

Grant peace in Thy day, Oh Lord, for Thine own, who fighteth for Thee only, Oh God, from whom are all holy desires, right counsels and good works given us, Thy servants, that peace which the world cannot give, that our hearts can give to Thy commandments, and fear of enemies can remove, that our days by Thy protection may be peaceful.

Our Father, Who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy Name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven, for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

MR. HENRY D. ESTABROOK: I am thinking there could be no better illustration of the paradoxical topsy-turvy notions pervading this Government on all sorts of questions, a fault from which even this association itself is not exempt, and will not be

until it emerges from an inspiration into an institution—voicing no alien sympathies, but concerned only with American affairs—than to put me forth as the medium of introducing to this distinguished audience the no less distinguished gentleman who is to preside over its deliberations this evening, a man who is known to everybody here, I take it, whilst it is as much as ever if I am known to anybody here. The anonymous will make known to you the unanimous. But I would be more or less than human if I didn't take advantage of the situation, your good nature and the absence of the police, to say a word or two on my own account, whilst my victim, my *raison d'etre*—and I guess if Mr. Roosevelt can call the President of the United States a "Byzantine logothete," I can venture to call the Mayor of New York a *"raison d'etre"*—whilst he is on the way here thinking over what he is going to say—if I give him a chance to say anything.

This Congress is dedicated to patriotism, and in my humble opinion the one paramount, overshadowing need of this country to-day is a new Declaration of American Independence, with the backbone and the old virility that went with it. (Applause.) The people are tired of epicene politicians, who are neither male nor female, fish, flesh, fowl nor good red herring—even a kippered herring has some red about him. When their manhood is questioned or imposed upon, the men of this country prefer the rocket's red glare to the splutter of a pin-wheel, the roar of cannon to the crackle of fire-crackers. There are worse things than war, gentlemen, just as there are worse things than death.

Paul Revere of revered memory, was a maker of church bells and cannon, and it was a holy alliance, for it takes the one to safeguard the other. (Applause.) Let his spirit, riding the clouds, shout down to us a warning of the danger and folly of supineness, rousing us once more to healthy and manly action. We are still a free people, are we not? Still engaged with this experiment of ours of self-government, trying to work out our own salvation without the guardianship of King, Czar, Pope or potentate. Who gave us our liberties? Nobody gave us our liberties. We conquered them for ourselves in war against a king—and no king ever yet surrendered to his subjects except upon compulsion. And as our government was won by war, so its integrity was preserved by war,

and so under God we will continue to defend it, by war if need be, though all the world should come at us in arms. (Loud applause.)

That is not rhetoric or bombast; it is the solemn statement of a solemn fact, and you know it. The placid assumption of the pacifists, so-called, that preparedness necessarily means war with somebody; that those in favor of it are less concerned than themselves in preserving the peace, is on a par with that extraordinary assumption once made by a candidate for President that all those who were in favor of an honest dollar and opposed to the free coinage of silver at sixteen to one were necessarily enemies of the common people and wanted to crucify them on a cross of gold—ridiculous extravagance when iron crosses are so cheap! (Laughter and applause.) And do you recall how near Mr. Bryan came to making the people believe all that? Lincoln said that you can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. An inscrutable destiny seems to have segregated and set apart Mr. Bryan as the mouthpiece and oracle of that contingent whom you can fool all the time. (Laughter.) And, unhappily, there are enough of them to make it worth his while. (Laughter.)

Now, I was told repeatedly during the last campaign, particularly out West, that all of the women of that region, almost to a woman, were opposed to any military program, and that they were not raising their boys to be soldiers. Well, the women of this country must henceforth be reckoned with in the politics of the country—reckoned with, even if they are not to be argued with. (Laughter.)

Speaking out of my experience as a son, father, and grandfather, I know that when a woman's motherhood is uppermost she is no longer a reasonable creature. You might as well argue with the north wind for blowing cold. Nor would the north wind blow cold on her little ones if like the mallard duck she could feather their nest by disfeathering herself. Oh, you mothers, you mothers, I know you. What man who ever knew a mother doesn't know you? You would slave for your boy; you would pray for him; you would beg, borrow, steal, or lie for him, and how gladly would you die for him—for him,

mind you, and only for him, the flesh and blood of your own begetting, not somebody else's boy.

When the mother bird is fighting a rattlesnake, or an elephant, for it is all one to her, she is not arguing; she is not reasoning; her altruism is not a matter of principle; nor does it reach so far as a neighboring nest. She is thinking only of her own. Nay, she is not thinking at all, but acts on an instinct common to all motherhood, a sort of glorfied selfishness, fatal, fearful, appalling and sublime. But no woman will ever be a statesman, nor to my mind is she even qualified to vote (applause) until she drops the M that masks her mentality, and motherhood becomes "otherhood." For she must think of others, or other mothers and of other boys who are perhaps fighting to protect her boy, and of other generations yet to be, for whose sake, no less than her own, God suffers her to be at all.

The five stalwart sons of the widow Bixby were killed in our Civil War. To be sure, they would have died anyway in the course of nature, but they and she have been immortalized by the immortal Lincoln. She was a mother and a widow who laid this costly sacrifice on the altar of her country. Was it too big a price to pay, O women of America, for the free, happy, united, regenerated America of to-day? Was she expecting too much if she expected that you and your sons in turn would defend America's honor with your lives? Don't raise your boys to be molly-coddles; raise your boys to be soldiers, for if they are manly boys they will be soldiers in spite of you, if only to save you from the unspeakable fate to which your sisters and your sex were abandoned in darkest Mexico. (Applause.)

"Oh," say your pacifists, "war is Hell; it has been the curse of the earth and it is time that the people should rise up in Christ's name and put an end to it." Amen and Amen. But how? They would attempt it, not by rising up, but by lying down. (Laughter.) How would Chinafying America conduce to this result? The people themselves seldom make war. Only kings make wars, and as long as there are kings on the earth, there are bound to be wars on earth. (Applause.) You can never hope for universal peace until every king and kinglet, every prince and princelet, together with their preposterous claims of divine right, together with all the pomps and shams and frauds of royalty, are extirpated from the earth. (Applause.)

The pacifist warns us that we should be afraid to trust our lives and fortunes and liberties to the guardianship of a standing army made up of American citizens, but he sees no danger whatever in committing all these precious things to the tender mercies of the armies of Europe and Japan. Excuse me! If I have got to live in terror of a standing army, I insist that it shall be a standing army of my fellow-citizens (applause) with as much to lose as I have, with the same ideals of liberty that I have, and not an army of foreign puppets, trained to do the bidding of some bloodthirsty tyrant. (Loud applause.)

But I want to recall to you that whatever menace a standing army may be to the liberties of a people, under some other form of government, it cannot obtain under our form of government, thanks to the wisdom of our forefathers who were as much opposed to militarism as we are. Napoleon said that an army crawls on its belly, meaning that it must have food and clothing and equipment; in other words, it must have money and lots of it.

Now our Constitution wisely requires that every revenue measure shall originate in the House of Representatives, the popular branch of our national legislature, so numerous in its membership that it may fairly be called the people themselves. Our Constitution wisely forbids Congress to make any appropriation of money for a longer period than two years, and limits even the term of a Congressman to two years. So you see that our army and our navy, and West Point itself, are absolutely dependent for their existence from year to year upon the will of the people. See how wonderfully history has vindicated this wisdom of our fathers. After every one of our wars, our armies have melted back into the body of the people as naturally and as inevitably as the smoke of battle melts into the firmament. Only if, in the words of a soldier poet.

> If by treacherous yielding chance
> Our land hath trafficked its splendid anger
> For only a lean inheritance
> Of outward lustness and inward languor;
> Why then, O comrades, it were full well
> If the shocks of our army were not over;
> For the Lord made men to conquer Hell,
> And not to fatten like kine in clover.

We have been taught from our youth that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We repeat this phrase over and over as a reminder of our duty, I hope, and not simply as a litany, which frequent mouthing has emptied of all meaning. And what is eternal vigilance, but eternal preparation? The sword of liberty is not a metaphor, nor a fountain pen. (Laughter.) So long as tyranny goes armed, liberty dare not disarm.

Now, I have talked longer than I intended, and longer certainly than anybody else intended I should. But there are some things that a man just must get out of his system or die of apoplexy.

Our Mayor has not yet put in an appearance, and I am requested to say that Major Abel Davis of Chicago, will make a few remarks on the subject before us this evening.

REMARKS OF MR. ABEL P. DAVIS, OF CHICAGO.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: At the suggestion of the delegates from Chicago, your Committee on Plan and Scope requested me to devote ten minutes to the presentation of my views on the subject of Universal Military Service and Training. You might choose me in the nature of "Exhibit A" in connection with the subject presented last evening by the former Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson. I have returned recently from Texas, having participated in the mobilization of troops as major in command of a battalion of the First Illinois Infantry. (Applause.)

Our Government's experience on the Mexican border demonstrated the weakness of our military system. In my judgment, this is not the time to discuss the advisability of the training of our youth, nor is this the time for devoting any of our efforts and energies to the discussion of the extent of that training, should we decide to give them one, nor of the length of time which should be devoted by the young of this country in acquiring the necessary military knowledge.

To my mind, the question at this time is what shall be done in order to give the Government of the United States the required number of men in order that our Government, when the occasion arises, may have an army sufficient in size, well enough trained and seasoned and equipped to meet successfully the aggression of any enemies that may threaten the shores of

our land. One important phase of that main question is what legislation should we ask at the hands of Congress in order that that result may be obtained. This Congress, of which I am glad to be a member, is an aggregation of men and women who have given a demonstration of their unselfish interest and desire to be of service to our common country. We have made a specific declaration of being in favor of constructive patriotic action. Along military lines, the only constructive, concrete suggestion which has been made is the desirability of securing legislation which will enable our Federal Government to give the youth of this country a certain amount of military training.

I am the last person to underrate the value of such legislation, the value of the institution of such legislation, from the benefit that will be derived by the young securing such training, as well as the country at large in the aggregate.

I ask the question at this time if, in view of everything that has been said at this Congress and at the sessions of the National Security League preceding this particular session, in view of the patriotic speeches that have been made by the leaders of American thought before this Congress, who not only by their word, but by their lives, in the service of their country, have inspired us to the highest ideals of Americanism, if in this atmosphere on this occasion we have a right to limit ourselves along constructive lines to one detail, only one feature of a general plan which will equip this country to successfully defeat the aggression of our possible enemies?

My experience in 1898 as a private in the ranks and in service in Cuba, and continued service in the National Guard since that date, my consultation with other officers of the National Guard, officers of the regular army, present members of the general staff of the army, and with the officials of the division of militia affairs of the army have led me to conclude that it would be wise to evolve and present a plan for the military establishment of the United States which bears the approval of all those whom I have enumerated, and with whom I have consulted.

The features which should be incorporated in this plan for the establishment of an army and for a navy, with such modifications as that branch of the service may dictate, are the following: The first line of defense shall consist of the National army; the second, of the National Guard of the several States; the

third, of the Reserve. The country should be divided into military districts and the Congressional district of the present time should also be the military district, in charge of an official of the Government of the United States.

According to this plan, in each one of those districts, the young men, upon arriving at the age of nineteen, shall be registered with that official. From this registration list shall be eliminated the names of those who fail to pass the required physical examination, as well as those who happen to be the sole support of their families, and, bearing in mind that the age of registration is nineteen, I imagine those cases will be very few.

The War Department shall each year make requisition on each military district for the number of young men required for the National army of the United States. All those registered on those lists shall be divided into two classes, and the general division is this: In the first class shall be such of the young men as voluntarily put themselves in the way of securing military training. In the second class will be the young men who do not put themselves in the way of getting any training.

In the first class, then, are the young men who are pursuing their studies in schools, colleges and universities. Their work should not be interrupted, but they should be given an opportunity to voluntarily secure military training of the sort and of the amount prescribed by the War Department of the United States. In the same class shall be put the young men who are members of the National Guard.

In the second class, then, will be all the other young men who are neither at school nor members of the National Guard, and from the second class, in the first instance, shall be drawn the required number of men to constitute the National army of the United States. If there are not enough men in the second class, the Government shall have the right to take the required quota from the first. (Applause.)

The service in the National army shall be for a period which our military experts agree is necessary to give the country a trained and seasoned army. At the expiration of service, either in the National Army or in the National Guard, or at the expiration of the course of training in schools, all the young men shall go into the reserve. The reserve shall be called together in respective classes at least once a year, for such periods as the

War Department may determine. So that in fact, as well as in law, we will establish a system whereby all the male inhabitants of the United States will be trained, not only along personal, but along organizational lines as well, and be ready at all times to be of aid to the first line of defense whenever that emergency arises.

I have just about two more minutes, and I propose to devote them, with your permission, to pointing out the advantages of the plan. In the first instance, every young man upon arriving at the age of nineteen, will secure military training as a member of either the National Army or the National Guard, in schools, colleges and universities. The National Army, the first line of defense, shall consist of all classes of young men of the United States.

There is no room in a free republic for a trained army. The people must constitute the army and the army must constitute the people. (Applause.)

As to the size of that army, provided for by the people, we must consult the military experts. Opinions have been expressed on this subject based on scientific study of the matter. The figures vary from 250,000 to 500,000. The latter is required to be a safe number on the basis of having a second line, and on the basis of having a reserve. Estimating that required strength of 500,000 by the number of Congressional districts, which are 435, the required number of men to be furnished by each Congressional district for the National army of the United States will be 500—not enough to affect in any way the industrial conditions of the country.

The second effect of the plan suggested by me will be that all of the young men who have served in the National Army and all the young men completing their course of training in the National Guard and in the schools will go into the Reserve.

Germany, in the first instance, was compelled to create a system of Reserves. When at Jena, Napoleon shattered the Prussian army, he insisted in incorporating in the Treaty of Tilzit a provision limiting the strength of the Prussian army to 42,000 men. The illustrious Scharnhorst devised a scheme of placing the men in the army for only a short period and putting them into the Reserve, and giving them training for brief periods while they remained in the Reserve.

When seven years later, in 1813, Prussia once more was called to the front to test its strength, although it had a population of only five million people, it produced an army of 300,000 soldiers, 250,000 of whom were the trained Reserves of Scharnhorst. And to-day in Germany, and in every other country engaged in the terrible conflict across the water, the battles are being fought out by the Reservists of the respective countries.

Another feature of my plan will be the building up of the National Guard. A word on that and I am through. There is a feeling abroad that there is no room for the National Guard. It is my judgment, it is the judgment of every man who has looked into the question, that if any system is at this time adopted ignoring the National Guard, even though it is limited to one little feature of universal military training of the youth, the National Guard will be disbanded. The question might be raised whether there is any necessity for it. As a State institution, it has proven its usefulness.

Time does not permit discussion of the legal complications of the provisions of the Constitution of the respective States and of the Federal Constitution. The basis of it all is that each State must depend on its own military force for its existence as a sovereign State of the Union. The provision is that the training of the National Guard, as well as in the schools shall be of a sort that is prescribed by the Federal Government, that in itself will raise the standard of efficiency in the National Guard, and give the country the kind of a National Guard which our Federal Government, as represented by the War Department, may demand.

If my plan may to some extent contain faulty features, I call upon this Congress to correct it. To the extent that the plan in its entirety may be faulty, I call upon the Congress to substitute another. My plea to the Congress in general is that concrete action must come from all of our deliberations. (Loud applause.)

MR. ESTABROOK: I wish that Major Davis would have joined the ranks of certain ladies who, I understand, are camping on the steps at the White House and insist upon repeating that speech to the occupant. (Laughter.)

There has to be some change in this program and I am requested to announce that Mrs. Douglas Robinson, of New York, will be the next speaker. I have the honor to present her. (Applause.)

REMARKS

Mrs. Douglas Robinson of New York

MRS. DOUGLAS ROBINSON: I did not expect to come so early on the program, so if you find me halting or hesitating, you will know that it is because I really haven't had quite time to prepare. I shall not take more than five minutes. I am here simply to give the point of view, through his letter, of my brother, Col. Theodore Roosevelt. (Loud applause.)

I would very much rather hear the applause than read the letter. I have come to read the letter, but perhaps you will let me have just five minutes before I read it, because I feel that I really must express five minutes' worth of my own opinion about the wonderful work that the National Security League has done and is doing. (Applause.)

I think from the very beginning I took a little interest, but now I take all the time more and more interest in the enormous work of splendid constructive patriotism that this body of men who started the National Security League has done. It seems to me that it is one of the most vital factors in our whole country of inspiring the youth of the country.

I want to tell you, in a very brief way, something that happened to me the other day which really has come about through work which the National Security League and the Plattsburg Camp are doing. A young man who is in business in New York—he is really young, and just about making his first initial successes—came to me the other day very seriously, and asked my opinion as to whether he should give up his business career entirely for the present and simply go about and try to be a voice for preparedness. He really meant it. (Applause.) He meant it absolutely. He was perfectly willing. He is a very ambitious person, with a great desire to be a business success, and yet the work that this League has done, the work that the Plattsburg Camp has done, has filled him with a great enthusiasm for his country's need, and he honestly wished to give up the

possibility—he was just at the moment where he was about to be a success in the business world which he was willing to sacrifice—if it was the best thing to do. I personally did not think that he had the right to do it, and I advised him against it.

I only mention the incident because it shows what such work as the National Security League and the Plattsburg Camp is doing in the heart of the youth of America. And that is the one vital and important thing at this moment in America, to arouse the youth of America. (Applause.)

I want to say one other thing, and perhaps I haven't the slightest right to say this—I don't know whether everybody here is a member of the National Security League or not. I don't know whether perhaps some of them have come—which they naturally might do—to listen to the distinguished people who are going to speak to them. But if they are not members of the National Security League and if they do enjoy honestly the enthusiasm and the eloquence and the oratory which they are about to hear, it seems to me that if they go away and don't become members, they put themselves a little bit in the position that I remember so delightfully described by Prof. William James in his wonderful little epic called "Habit." Some of you may remember it and some not. He described how many people go, we will say, to a wonderful operatic performance and come away enormously excited by the music, enormously emotionalized and spiritualized, and feeling that they could do anything. "And then," says Prof. James, "if they are coming back in a street car and see a person with packages and don't get up to give that person, if it is a woman, a seat, they haven't any right to that emotionalized feeling about the great music."

And he goes even further than that and says that perhaps the person who has been so excited by the wonderful experience he has been through, at least might speak genially to his aunt. So now, whenever my nephews are very much thrilled over anything, I always say, remember, "speak genially to your aunt." (Laughter.)

Therefore, if you are thrilled with these wonderful sessions and by listening to the splendid voices that are leading you onward, speak genially to your aunt by becoming members of the National Security League. (Applause.)

My brother I saw only yesterday. I breakfasted with him at the unholy hour at which he loves to breakfast. From his earliest youth, he has always liked to have breakfast parties at 8:15, so that one has to go out in a very chill dawn to wherever he is and breakfast with him. He told me particularly to not only read his speech, but to bear his message of good will to every one here who is working in this cause, and that he wished he might be here himself so that no speech need be read. (Applause.)

The letter begins: "My dear Mr. Menken":—It is addressed to Mr. Menken, to whom it should be addressed, as he most certainly has borne the banner and the brunt of war in starting this National Security League. (Applause.)

Mrs. Robinson then read the letter from Col. Roosevelt, as follows:

LETTER FROM THEODORE ROOSEVELT

New York, January 10th, 1917.

My Dear Mr. Menken:

As it is unfortunately impossible for me to be present in person, I desire in this letter to express my heartiest good wishes for the success of your meeting and my belief that the movement in which you are engaged is one of the really vital movements—indeed at the moment it is I think *the* really vital movement—for the ultimate honor and welfare of this country.

We need, more than anything else in this country, thorough-going Americanism,—for unless we are Americans and nothing else, we are not a nation at all—and thorough-going preparedness in time of peace against war—for if we are not thus prepared we shall remain a nation only until some more virile nation finds it worth while to conquer us.

The work of preparedness—spiritual and material, civic, industrial and military—and the work of Americanization are simply the two paramount phases or elements of the work of constructive patriotism which your Congress has gathered to foster. There can be no real preparedness in this country unless this country is thoroughly Americanized; for only a patriotic people will prepare; and there can be no deep national feeling for America until we are all of us Americans through and through.

Americanism means many things. It means equality of rights and, therefore, equality of duty and of obligation. It means service to our common country. It means loyalty to one flag, to our flag, the flag of all of us. It means on the part of each of us respect for the rights of the rest of us. It means that all of us guarantee the rights of each of us. It means free education, genuinely representative government, freedom of speech and thought, equality before the law for all men, genuine political and religious freedom and the democratizing of industry so as to give at least a measurable equality of opportunity for all, and so as to place before us as our ideal in all industries where this ideal is possible of attainment, the system of co-operative ownership and management, in order that the tool users may, so far as possible, become the tool owners. Everything is un-American that tends either to government by a plutocracy or government by a mob. To divide along the lines of section or caste or creed is un-American. All privileges based on wealth, and all enmity to honest men merely because they are wealthy, are un-American—both of them equally so. Americanism means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity, and hardihood—the virtues that made America. The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, safety-first instead of duty-first, the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

Preparedness must be of the soul no less than of the body. We must keep lofty ideals steadily before us, and must train ourselves in practical fashion so that we may realize these ideals. Throughout our whole land we must have fundamental common purposes, to be achieved through education, through intelligent organization and through the recognition of the great vital standards of life and living. We must make Americanism and Americanization mean the same thing to the native-born and to the foreign-born; to the man and to the woman; to the rich and to the poor; to the employer and to the wage-worker. If we believe in American standards, we shall insist that all privileges springing from them be extended to immigrants, and that they in return accept these standards with whole-hearted and entire loyalty. Either we must stand absolutely by our ideals and conceptions of duty, or else we are against them. There is no

middle course, and if we attempt to find one, we insure for ourselves defeat and disaster.

Citizenship must mean an undivided loyalty to America; there can be no citizenship on the 50-50 basis; there can be no loyalty half to America and half to Germany or England or France or Ireland, or any other country. Our citizens must be Americans, and nothing else, and if they try to be something else in addition, then they should be sent out of this country and back to the other country to which, in their hearts, they pay allegiance. We must have one American language; the language of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, of Lincoln's Gettysburg Speech and Second Inaugural, and of Washington's farewell address. The American standard of living conditions and the American standard of working conditions both must be high. We must insist upon them for immigrants as well as for the native-born. We must insist that the people who work here, live here; that they are not mere birds of passage from abroad. We must insist upon industrial justice, and we cannot get it if we let ignorance and need be preyed upon either by vulpine cunning or by wolfish brutality, and if we do not train the ignorant and the needy up to self-reliance and efficiency.

Preparedness does not mean merely a man with a gun. It means that too; but it means a great deal more. It means that in this country we must secure conditions which will make the farmer and the working man understand that it is in a special sense their country; that the work of preparedness is entered into for the defense of the country which belongs to them, to all of us, and the government of which is administered in their interest, in the interest of all of us. At this moment, Lloyd George is able to do more than any other man in rallying the people of Great Britain to the defense of that Empire, because the working men, the men who actually do the manual labor, know that he has their welfare at heart, that the nationl ideal for which he is fighting is that which will give them the best chance for self-development, and for that happiness which comes to the man who achieves his rights at the same time that he performs his duties. He is followed by the people as a whole because they know that he stands for the people as a whole. We in America who are striving for preparedness must make it evident that the preparedness is to serve the people as a

whole. The war on the other side has shown that there can be no efficient army in the field unless the men behind are trained and efficient and unless they are whole-heartedly loyal in their patriotic devotion to their country. Here in America we must do justice to the workers, or they will not feel that this is the country to which their devotion is due; and we must exact patriotic devotion to the flag from them, for if they fail to render it they are unfit to live in this country at all. I appeal to all Americans to join in the common effort for the common good. Any man who holds back and refuses to serve his country with whole-hearted devotion, on the ground that enough has not been done for him, will do well to remember that any such holding back or lukewarmness of patriotism is itself an admission of inferiority, and admission of personal unfitness for citizenship in a democracy, and ought to deprive him of the rights of citizenship. As for the men of means, from whom we have the right to expect a special quality of leadership, let them remember that, as much has been given to them so much will be expected of them, and that they have no moral right whatsoever to the enjoyment of the ease and the comforts of life beyond what their fellows enjoy unless they render service beyond what their fellows render.

I advocate military preparedness not for the sake of war, but for the sake of safeguarding this nation against war so long as that is possible, and of guaranteeing its honor and safety if war should nevertheless come. We hope ultimately the day will come on this earth when wars will cease. But at present the realization of that hope seems as far in the future as the realization of that other hope, that some day in the future all crime shall cease. By wise action, based equally on observed good faith and on thoroughly prepared strength—the precise characteristics which during the last few years we have failed to show—we may hope to limit the probable field of wars; but at present it is as certain as anything can be that every great nation will at some time or other, as generations follow generations, have to face war, and that ours will be no exception to the rule. It is, therefore, not merely folly, but criminal and unpatriotic folly, to fail to prepare, or to preach the ignoble cult of the professional pacifist, the peace-at-any-price man.

We need first and foremost a thoroughly efficient and large Navy; a navy kept under professional guidance; a navy trained

at every point with the sole purpose of making it the most formidable possible instrument of war the moment that war comes; a navy, the mismanagement of which shall be treated as a capital offense against the nation. In the next place, we need a small but highly efficient regular army, of say a quarter million men; an army where provision is made for a certain proportion of the promotions to be by merit, instead of merely seniority; an army of short-term soldiers, better paid than at present; and an army which, like the navy, shall be under the guidance of a general staff. Moreover, every year there should be at one time field maneuvers of from fifty to one hundred thousand men, so that the Army Commander, the Corps Commanders, the Division, Brigade and Regimental Commanders, who would have to face a foe at the outbreak of war would all have had experience in performing their duties, under actual field conditions, in time of peace.

The events of the last summer have shown that the Hay Bill was as foolish and unpatriotic a bit of flintlock legislation as was ever put on the statute book. I have the greatest admiration and respect for the individual militiamen who went to the border. But the system under which they were sent worked rank injustice to most of them, rank favoritism for some of them, and was worse than ineffective from the national standpoint. It is folly and worse than folly, to pretend that the National Guard is an efficient second line of defense. Remember also that the laws passed nominally for the betterment of the Regular Army and Navy are producing almost no result. The delays in building the ships are extraordinary. The shortage of enlisted men in the Navy and Army is appalling, nor is it being made good. It cannot wholly be made good under the volunteer system. But much could be done. Our first care should be to make the Navy and the Regular Army thoroughly efficient.

But this is not enough. To trust only to the Navy and the Regular Army amounts merely to preparing to let the other men do it. If we ordinary citizens are fit to be citizens of this country, we shall fit ourselves to defend this country. No man has a right to citizenship in a democracy if, for any cause whatsoever, he is unwilling to fight, or is morally or mentally incapable of fighting, for the defense of that democracy against a powerful alien aggressor. If a man is physically unfit but is right in his

soul and in his head, then he can render high service to the nation although incapable of bearing arms. But, if from any moral or mental causes, he is unwilling to train himself to bear arms, and to bear them if necessary in his country's cause, then he has no moral right to vote.

Be it remembered that such a national armed force as that for which I ask, while very powerful for defense would be almost useless for aggression. I wish to see our Navy second only to that of Great Britain, because Great Britain is the only power whose naval needs are greater than ours. I do not ask that our Army become second, or anywhere near second, to Germany's, because Germany's military needs are far greater than ours; but merely that relatively to our size our Army be made to correspond to that of Switzerland.

This would mean that for the last two or three years of school our boys would have some military training, substantially such as is given in the Swiss and Australian schools; and that at about the age of nineteen they would spend six months in actual service in the field (or at sea with the fleet) with the colors, and would thereafter for three or four years be required to spend a couple of weeks each year with the colors. Each year, among those who had served well for the six months, a number could be chosen to be trained as officers. These would then be given by the nation for two years, free, a training somewhat like that at West Point, although not as rigid or as thorough. They would be required to pay for this training by, for a certain number of months during each of the few following years, doing their part in drilling the recruits of that year. It would probably be necessary to pay the recruits a small minimum wage so as to be sure that the poorest family would not suffer hardship because of the absence of the young man for six months. No man would be allowed to purchase exemption. The sons of the richest men in the land would have to serve exactly like anyone else and do exactly the same work—which, incidentally, would be a bit of uncommon good fortune for them.

Side by side with this preparation of the manhood of the country must go the preparation of its resources. The Government should keep a record of every factory or workshop of any kind which would be called upon to render service in war, and of all the railroads. All the workers in such factories and

railroads should be tabulated so that in the event of war they would not be sent to the front if they could do better service where they were—although as far as possible every strong man should be sent to the front, to the position of danger, while work done in safety should be done by women and old men. The transportation system should receive special study. Factories which would be needed in time of war should be encouraged by the Government to keep themselves properly prepared in time of peace, and should be required to fill specimen orders, so that there would be no chance of their breaking down in the event of a sudden call at the outbreak of war. Industrial preparedness must go hand in hand with military preparedness.

Indeed, this military preparedness and the acceptance by the nation of the principle of universal, obligatory military training in time of peace as a basis of universal, obligatory service in time of war, would do more than anything else to help us solve our most pressing social and industrial problems in time of peace. It would Americanize and nationalize our people as nothing else could possibly do. It would teach our young men that there are other ideals besides making money. It would render them alert, energetic, self-reliant, capable of command and willing to obey; respectful to others and demanding respect from others for themselves. It would be the best possible way to teach us how to use our collective strength in order to accomplish those social and industrial tasks which must be done by all of us collectively if we are to do them well.

Just before this war began, the male and female apostles of folly and fatuity were at their highest pitch of denunciation of preparedness, and were announcing at the tops of their voices that never again would there be a great war. These preachers of professional pacifism, of peace-at-any-price, of peace put before righteousness and honor and duty, temporarily lead astray many good and earnest men and women. These good, honest, intelligent men and women can be shown the facts and when shown the facts will ultimately see the profound immorality as well as the utter folly of the professional pacifist or peace-at--any-price position. There is, however, little to hope for as regards the professional pacifists themselves. The antics of their brethren in England has shown that even although brayed in a

mortar their folly shall not depart from them. At the moment, their clamor is drowned by the thunder of the great war. But when this war comes to an end their voices will be as loud as ever on behalf of folly and wickedness, and their brazen effrontery will be proof against all shame as well as against all wisdom. They will unblushingly repeat every prophecy that has just been falsified by the merciless march of events; they will reiterate all the promises that have always been broken in the past and will always be broken in the future. They are in the majority of cases primarily concerned for the safety of their own wretched bodies, and they are physically safe in the course they follow, for if the disaster they court should come upon this nation, they would themselves instantly flee to safety, while their folly and wrong-doing would be atoned for by the blood of better and braver men.

It is useless to appeal to these persons. But it is necessary to warn our people against them. If our people fail to prepare, whatever the real reason may be and whatever the reason is which they allege, their fate in the end will be the same. Sooner or later, in such case, either we ourselves or our children will tread the stony path of disaster and eat the bitter bread of shame.

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

S. Stanwood Menken, Esq.,
Chairman, Committee on Congress of Constructive Patriotism,
National Security League, Inc.,
31 Pine Street, New York.

MR. ESTABROOK: I guess we are agreed that Mr. Roosevelt's speech has lost nothing in effect in the delivery of it by his chosen ambassador. (Applause.) What it may have lacked in personal aggressiveness has been more than compensated in personal pulchritude. (Applause.)

I am requested to read some telegrams from Toledo, Ohio, just showing how one city of this country stands on the question under consideration to-night. The first is from the Toledo "Times":

> "Toledo Times expects to support editorially movement for universal military training." (Applause.)

Here is another from the Toledo "News Bee":

> "Responding to Mr. Theobald's telegram, the News-Bee has been committed for several months to Swiss system of military training."

(Applause.)

We also have one from Mr. I. E. McComber, president of the Toledo Commerce Club:

> "Trustees of Toledo Commerce Club following with deep interest proceedings convention National Security League. You may count on us to place before the four thousand members of this organization a constructive program of American patriotism and preparedness."

(Applause.)

Mr. John N. Willys sends us this:

> "I am heartily in accord with the universal military training movement, not from the standpoint of militarism, but from the standpoint of mental and physical development of our youths. War or no war it is a great thing for our young men. You have my hearty co-operation."

(Applause.)

The speaker *pro tempore* of this evening has arrived. (Applause.) Before introducing that tardy individual (Laughter) I am requested to notify you that Mr. Perry Belmont has written a very able paper on "The Promotion of Governmental Efficiency," and you can obtain a copy of it in the lobby on the way out.

Now, there is no man in the United States who has done more to instruct the public conscience along the lines of the topic assigned for this evening's consideration, or is himself doing better patriotic service in the cause of good government, than the man whom you have chosen to act as your Chairman this evening. He knows what I thought of him when he entered on the duties of his great office, and I want to say to him thus publicly, that I have had no occasion to change my sentiments. (Applause.) On the contrary, Democrat as he calls himself, I here and now pledge my Republican vote to him for almost any office he has a mind to aspire to. (Applause.)

I take great pleasure in discharging the agreeable but wholly superfluous function of introducing to you Mr. John Purroy Mitchel, among the best, and, so far as I am aware, the very best Mayor New York City has ever had. (Loud applause.)

ADDRESS

John Purroy Mitchel, Mayor of the City of New York

Mr. Estabrook, and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am glad that the Pennsylvania Railroad has seen fit to deposit me at Washington at last, although two hours late, that I may come to you and discharge the duties that have been laid upon me this evening.

We meet here at this session as a part of the Congress of Constructive Patriotism. We met here one year ago to attend a convention of the National Security League. A great deal has happened during that time, a great deal that is significant for this movement in which our interests are so deeply involved. A year ago we were trying to make the people of the United States listen to the gospel of universal military training and service. We were trying to get a hearing for it. It had not yet passed out of the stage of sneers and scoffs, and here at the National capital you couldn't find a man who wouldn't tell you that you might just as well give it up as to go to Congress and try to get a hearing there for that proposition.

But things are different to-day. Down here in Washington the proposition of universal military training gets a hearing in Congress. (Applause.) The men like Senator Chamberlain and others, who have labored so valiantly in this cause, are to-day preparing in Committee a bill to be introduced in Congress for universal military training (Applause) with very fair hopes that the measure will be reported out of Committee, and even that it has a chance of passage in the Senate.

No great constructive achievement is realized in a moment or in a day. This movement, that began only after the outbreak of the great war in Europe, has grown steadily, until to-day we have the prospect of the introduction of this measure into Congress, and we have this great convention called here at Washington to consider all phases of this program on constructive patriotism which includes this measure of preparedness as but one of its features; a program of constructive patriotism, a program of

National defense, defense by sea and on land, through the education of the people of the United States to an understanding of the meaning of National defense, of the necessity for it, of the historic background of it, and of the prospects of the future.

This is a worthy cause, a big undertaking, and one, ladies and gentlemen, that must be divorced absolutely and wholly from politics and partisan consideration. (Loud applause.) There is in this question of National patriotism, of loyalty to our country, and of service to the United States no room for partisanship. The man who thinks to make political capital for himself or for his party out of this great question, either by advocacy of a plan, or by attacks upon individuals, is unworthy to be found in the ranks of those who are supporting this great cause. (Applause.)

I am glad to be able to say that I believe the leaders, the great leaders of this movement, have not, in one single instance, as far as I know, stooped to those ends, or to the use of those ends. We must keep the movement free of it, and draw into this common cause all parties and all officials and all citizens who believe that the United States is worthy of their love and their service. (Applause.)

And yet, despite the advances that have been made, the results that have been achieved, the voice of pacificism is still heard in the land. It is a vociferous clamor that we hear at times from these people; they are very vocal. (Laughter.) They remind me of a metaphor which I heard the late Mayor Gaynor use more than once, and it was quite worthy of him. He used to say in speaking of some of the people that came into the Board of Estimate and were forever criticising without offering anything constructive in place of what they criticised, that one stridulent grasshopper shrilling in the corner of a fence would make more noise than a whole herd of cattle. (Laughter.)

And so it seems to me to be with these hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, when we read the account of some of the pacifist's speeches and arguments that have been made there. Pacifists may be classed into two groups; the loyal, honest visionary, the man who is and wants to be a good citizen of the United States, who isn't desirous of shirking his duty and who is not a coward, but who believes in disarmament and prostration.

The other is the dishonest, the contemptible, the mean, pacifist, who believes that there is not anything worth fighting for in this country, who believes that America represents to him and to his neighbors merely an opportunity and no obligation, who wishes to takes everything and who is willing to give nothing to the country. Although I am ashamed to say it, there are a number of such pacifists. I saw that one came from my own university, Columbia, and was heard recently before the Committee on Military Affairs, and I would willingly apologize to the country that my *alma mater* has sent out such a representative. (Applause.) Although there are a number of pacifists of that type, I think we may dismiss them, and consider seriously only those whose opinions are honest and whose attitude is based upon conviction.

The position of those pacifists is that war is really "not nice." (Laughter.) I saw that Mr. Ford (laughter) the other day said that instead of increasing the burden of taxes upon our people by the establishment of armaments, let us lay the foundation for disarmament. I don't know what he meant by laying the foundation for disarmament, but I suppose he meant to set the example to the world by making ourselves prostrate first. And he went on to say that the battle of life is hard enough without the battles of war. (Laughter.)

This is like the position of the man who argued that we had better disestablish doctors in order to end disease. (Laughter and applause.) Who wants war? Do we any more than the ultra-pacifists? No man who knows anything of the conditions of war wants it. The pacifists say, "Let's disarm, because we don't want war." We say, "Let's arm, and make ourselves safe, make ourselves formidable, because we don't want war; we want to discourage attack upon us." That would mean more. (Applause.)

Pacifists say that armament begets war, and yet the experience of the world teaches no such thing. In fact, it neither teaches that armament begets war, nor that in every case armament prevents war, but it does teach that the nation which is unprepared and is attacked, goes down and suffers.

The argument is made that if we train the young men of this country to become efficient units, we will merely create a National sentiment that will beget war. Yet Switzerland has done

that for years and years. Switzerland has an efficient army for her defense, and Switzerland is one of the few countries in Europe whose peace has not been disturbed. I think it is the concensus of opinion of all careful students of that problem, that she owes her immunity to her preparedness, to her readiness to resist. (Applause.)

The third position of the pacifists, the honest pacifists, is that a Nation can protect itself by doing justice. I haven't yet been able to convince myself that Belgium or Poland were able to defend themselves in that way, nor that the world offers any conspicuous example of a weak and defenseless people with an issue raised between it and a strong nation that was able to avoid attack or to secure justice for itself by doing justice to the stronger. (Applause.)

The ultimate position—and I had the advantage of discussing the theory of this question with one of the most distinguished and sincere pacifists that we have, the other day—the ultimate position of the Simon-pure pacifist is that, in the last analysis, if we are attacked, if we have attempted to do justice and are still attacked, it is better to surrender than to fight; (Laughter) that it is better in the ultimate service of the cause of international peace, to permit an injustice to be worked upon us, to permit even the deprivation of our liberties, to permit the loss of part of our territory, than to fight, because that sacrifice in the end will react and serve the great cause of international peace.

That may be a beautiful idealism, but I, for one, am not willing to subscribe to the doctrine that the United States of America should make of itself that kind of a sacrifice, even in the cause of ultimate international peace. (Loud applause.) The spirit that teaches that war is never justifiable, if it had permeated the people of the thirteen colonies, would have prevented the birth of this Republic. It was not the spirit of Lexington or Bunker Hill, it was not the spirit of Gettysburg, it was not the spirit that gave birth to or preserved this Nation, and it is not the spirit of a free people. (Applause.)

The issue, then, between pacifists and us is the issue of defense or prostration, of preparedness or prostration. If we are to be prepared, if we are to undertake measures of defense, then it is folly to be half-prepared, because then we are inclined

to lull ourselves into a state of mind that leads us to rely on these half measures for protection, and to raise issues that we wouldn't be foolish enough to raise if we knew that we had no defenses at all, or that we could raise and support if we had adequate defenses.

It seems to me, therefore, that the question lays between prostration on the one side and adequate and complete defense upon the other. If we would maintain our international policies, if we would maintain our international self-respect, if we would maintain our American ideals—and we have built up a certain body of doctrines, a very material part of it being built up during these three years, we have laid down certain principles of international relations, I might say of international law, which we declare are the convictions of America—if we are to maintain these principles and policies we must be prepared to stand behind them.

I repeat we must either be prepared to stand behind them, or frankly abandon them. We have built up a body of doctrines such as the doctrine of President Monroe. We must be prepared to stand behind it or we should frankly abandon it and declare that it has been forgotten by the American people. If we are prepared to sustain these doctrines and these ideals, then what shall we do for adequate defense? I pass over those phases of the question that relate to defense by sea, and propose to discuss only defense by land.

There are three possible methods, three possible systems. The first is the volunteer system, which we are trying to-day. The volunteer system, including the system of the National Guard, is now established under the Hay bill. It has been said so often, it has been proved so often, it has been demonstrated so often, that it is superfluous to repeat to-night that the volunteer system in this and every other country has been a failure in every National crisis. (Applause.) We have relied upon it before, and it has failed us. We relied upon it last year, and it failed us. We tried to bolster it up by the enactment of a bill which every careful, competent student of the question must have known or ought to have known, when it was in Congress, could only be a failure. It failed when it was applied and tried, and it will be a failure just as long as it is maintained. The sooner we recognize it, the better.

I have no quarrel with the National Guard. I have the highest respect and admiration for the men and the officers of the National Guard. (Applause.) They have given a high order of self-sacrificing service to their country when others wouldn't come forward to give that service. (Applause.) These men have drilled long hours in their armories. They have responded to the call of the Nation whenever it has been issued to them. They have served uncomplainingly, and that service has been an injustice to them because what was required of them has been equally required of every other man of military age in the republic. (Loud applause.)

I say to you to-night, knowing that I speak the sentiments of the great body of the men in the National Guard of this country, that they would prefer to see the inefficient system established by the Hay bill wiped out and universal compulsory military training and service substituted for it in the country. (Loud applause.) The present system, if it be carried forward, will not only mean an enormous increased cost, but it places upon the men who serve in the National Guard and go into the Reserve a special penalty.

After a man has served a period in the National Guard, after he has volunteered that service to his country and goes into the Reserve, he is subject to call first, before a call issued to volunteers. So that, not only has he given those years of service, but he has laid upon himself the disadvantage of a liability to a call before any levy is made upon the other men who are not willing to come forward and to give the same service to the country that he was willing to give. That system has been perpetuated or crystallized in the Hay bill by what I may term the "political" officers of the National Guard. We find them in several states. They are Adjutant-Generals, very often not military men, very often merely political accidents who have found their way into the Guard and who came down to Washington last year and conducted here, as everybody knows, an active and a successful lobby for the Hay bill, in order to continue their own emoluments, their own opportunities. (Applause.)

I know that the rank and file of the National Guard would have preferred then, as they would prefer now, to see universal military training and service established in place of the system

of the Hay bill. If we are not to have the volunteer system, then we must have some compulsory system and we must choose between a compulsory system that is selective and one that is universal. A selective system is not a democratic nor efficient one. A selective system means a perpetuation of the same false principles that are involved in the National Guard system, making one man do what is the other's equal duty. (Applause.)

If we are to have a compulsory duty laid upon any of the men of the Republic, it must be laid upon all alike. (Applause.) And so the National Security League, and all the other patriotic organizations of the country that subscribe to the proposition of National preparedness have endorsed as the only means of establishing effective defense upon land, the system of universal compulsory military training and service.

May I say in passing that the men who themselves have volunteered to train and to learn what military duty means are perhaps not the worst authorities in the United States upon this question. (Applause.) The Military Training Camp Association of the United States, made up, I think of every man who went through Plattsburg, twenty thousand of them, has declared that the primary purpose of that Association shall be to secure the establishment of universal training in the country. (Applause.)

This, then, is our program, a bill to lay that duty upon every man of military age. Such a bill is in process of preparation. It should have certain main features. It should require of every man physically fit a service of not less than six months in his eighteenth or nineteenth year, the year in which he first becomes physically fit for training in the field, and when his economic usefulness has not attained its maximum. The exemptions to that training should be based only upon physical unfitness, and be granted for no other reason. (Applause.) The men who have given themselves to a study of this method declare that with this law in force, this Nation can count each year on the training of 500,000 men, and that that system would cost the Nation about $150,000,000 annually.

When we consider the cost, I like to think of it in terms of insurance. Statistics may be made to show almost anything, I know, but I think it will not be out of point to consider the cost as an insurance premium upon the assessed valuation of the Atlantic sea-board cities in the Atlantic States, because you can

consider the cost of National defense as a legitimate insurance of the property interests of the country. I have applied this merely to the taxable values along the Atlantic sea-coast.

When you consider that it ought to be applied to the taxable values of the United States, and then to the business interests of the United States, which would be impaired and shattered in the event of even a minor war, you can see how conservative these figures are. The average fire insurance rate in the United States is about ten dollars a thousand. The assessed values of the Atlantic seaboard cities are eighteen billion dollars. One hundred and fifty million dollars as a premium would represent about eight dollars and a half a thousand, a figure less than the average fire insurance rate in the United States. The nineteen Atlantic sea-coast states have an aggregate assessed value of forty and a half billion dollars. The hundred and fifty million dollars applied to that would represent a premium of three dollars and sixty-nine cents a thousand—a fairly conservative insurance premium against disaster.

We advocate this system, of course, as a measure of National defense, and although it would be justified for that reason alone, it does possess certain other distinct and fundamental advantages.

The educational value is the development in the young man of initiative, of balanced judgment, of the capacity to think for himself when he has been given a duty to perform. All these things are developed by a system of military training in the camps. All these things we saw developed at Plattsburg, and we know the value of that kind of training, mental and physical.

Then the disciplinary value. If there is one thing that the youth of the United States need to learn more than another, it is respect for authority. (Applause.) I have heard it argued that military training makes a man servile. That is a slander. It does no such thing. The salute to a superior officer is no act of servility. It is an act of civility. Taking an order from a superior officer in no way degrades a man. It teaches him that the man who knows more than he does and who is competent to direct him ought to have the authority to tell him what to do. As he learns to obey he learns also how to direct. That is the disciplinary value of military training that we so sadly need in the United States.

There is also the democracy of the system, that rests upon the common obligation upon all alike, the fact that rich and poor, high and low, are brought together in the one place and are trained side by side and developed there, a reciprocal respect and understanding that they get in no other relation of life. (Applause.)

I notice the snobbery of a statement before the Committee of the Senate, when, referring to the fact that Mr. Astor and his valet occupied the same tent, the satisfaction that the socially elect took from that fact was emphasized. That is snobbery, that statement; but the fact that men are willing to go into these camps and meet their fellow-men on equal terms and on the common basis of a common service to their common country is not snobbery, it is democracy. (Loud applause.)

And then, fortunately, there is the Americanizing value of universal training. If we could take the new citizens of our country and teach them by this service to their new nation the obligation that they owe it, we would be doing something to make of them better citizens in a shorter time. We know, if we look about us, that many of these people come to our doors recognizing in America an opportunity, looking upon it merely as a personal opportunity and seeing in it no obligation. We must teach them that America is an obligation as well as an opportunity, that they owe an obligation, not only to their country, but their country owes an obligation to mankind and to the world, and that they, as its citizens, must be prepared to carry that burden and to meet that issue. (Applause.)

And so we must decide whether this Nation is to retain her ideals, her ideals of democracy and of justice and of international law, the doctrines that she has developed during these hundred and thirty years of life, or whether she is to abandon them, whether she is to denude herself of the means at hand to make herself effective in the world in the cause of humanity and right. She must decide that question, and when she has decided it, her course is open. She must prepare, and she must prepare now.

If we are to be worthy, then, of the sacrifices of the men who gave this Nation birth, and of those who preserved and protected it, if we are to be worthy of the institution of self-government that they conceived and that we now enjoy, if we

are to be worthy of the heritages of a free people and are to transmit them unimpaired to a race that will continue free, we must resolve now to dedicate this brief service of our youth to the cause of National security, National self-respect, National integrity and International peace. (Loud applause.)

CHAIRMAN MITCHEL: Ladies and Gentlemen: It has been a crime and a slander that we have been led to utter against Ministers of the Gospel that they are all pacifists. I am going to disprove that to you to-night in my introduction of the next speaker. For myself let me say that I have found among clergymen the staunchest supporters of this proposition of National preparedness upon moral lines and upon moral grounds. (Applause.)

And the staunchest of all of them, who has again and again testified to this fact, is Dr. William T. Manning, Rector of Trinity Parish, New York, whom I now present to you. (Applause.)

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING FROM THE STANDPOINT OF A CHRISTIAN

Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., Rector of Trinity Parish, New York City

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I find myself laboring under two disadvantages. The first is in being temporarily deprived of my voice, which is a somewhat necessary factor in making a speech. The second is that I have just been privately notified that I must cut down my speech to I really forget what proportion. I fear that the gentleman who brought me that message must have heard of an early experience of mine, when Admiral Schley visited the city of Nashville, in which I was then living. The next morning the papers recorded it in these words: "Admiral Schley attended Christ Church last night and listened to a sermon by the rector, the Rev. W. T. Manning, after which he was driven to his hotel and took a much-needed rest." (Laughter.)

One of the most important questions which our country is now called upon to face is that of adequate defense. The belief that all wars between civilized peoples were at an end has been

rudely dispelled. And the last remnant of the theory as to the safety afforded us by 3000 miles of ocean was shattered when the U-53 appeared in Newport harbor. No one in this country wants an army for aggression or attack upon others. The only question before us is that of home defense, the necessity of which has been made so tragically evident.

But we have as one element in our national life a large body of avowedly anti-patriotic people who oppose and denounce all adequate measures for military defense. This active propaganda of Pacifism has influenced the judgment and confused the minds of many of our people. It is not surprising that it should have done so, for while its teachings are unsound and unbalanced, they are not wholly untrue. This movement emphasizes some great truths which appeal powerfully and rightly to all of us. But sincere and well meaning as it is it is doing much harm to our country. It has led many to suppose that military service is to be decried and looked down upon, and that any use of military force is unethical, and un-Christian.

Such a view is indefensible, out of accord with the facts of life, unjust to religion, destructive of loyal citizenship, and seriously hurtful to the life of our nation. If this false theory is allowed to delude and mislead our people, we shall awaken some day to find ourselves unfitted to meet the demand of a great emergency, and robbed of that spirit which alone can carry a nation through its time of crisis.

It is, however, being widely disseminated by anarchists, and socialists of various kinds, by teachers in our public schools, by a considerable number of radical college professors, and by not a few ministers of religion.

I wish, therefore, to speak on this subject of Universal Military Training, not only as a citizen, but specifically from the religious standpoint and as one who is a fully believing and unashamed Christian. In view of the confusion of mind which has been created it seems right for some of those who represent the Church to speak out openly and clearly.

Let us consider some of the questions which are in the minds of people as to this matter.

1. Is it true that for a sincere and consistent Christian the use of force is never justifiable?

When the question is plainly put to them, many Pacifists disavow this position; but it is nevertheless the premise upon which most of their arguments and appeals are based.

So far is this position from being true that no one can fully maintain it. There are many cases in which one who should fail to use all the force in his power for the protection of mother, wife, or daughter, would forfeit the name of a man, as well as that of a Christian. We all know that the use of police power is both right and necessary. And yet I read in one of our New York evening papers not long ago, an editorial which held up the little group of "conscientious objectors" as the only true examples of the Christian spirit in Great Britain, and which condemned the Church of England for giving its countenance to those who are taking part in the present war.

Is this a true and sound view? Are we to hold that the young man who, owing to his conscientious scruples declines to take part in the defense of his home and country, is a more consistent Christian than the young man who, with no love of war, but from sheer sense of duty sacrifices everything that he cares for and gives his life for the cause that he believes to be right, and for the defense of those dependent upon his protection. The question, when plainly stated, answers itself. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And still, as in the editorial referred to, it is constantly taken for granted that a man who refuses to use force is necessarily a truer Christian than one who does use it.

2. Although the use of force is at times justifiable is it true that the New Testament teaches "non-resistance" in a sense which condemns military measures and the avocation of the soldier?

This is not the teaching of the New Testament, and the dissemination of the idea that it does so teach, works great harm to the Christian religion. It makes many men imagine that Christianity is out of harmony with real life, and that there is a conflict between its teachings and the highest instincts of their hearts and consciences. Christianity teaches nothing that is inconsistent with true manhood.

If it were true that the Christian religion forbids us to protect those dependent upon us, and to make every effort to do this effectively, the result would be that normal men would re-

ject the Christian religion, and they would be right in doing so. Such a teaching would disprove its claim to be a Divine Revelation. The New Testament gives us a Divine Gospel, but it gives us also a Gospel that is truly human. The effort to identify it with Ultra Pacifism does the Christian religion grave injustice. As a matter of fact those who most fully accept and believe the teachings of the New Testament are seldom found to be Pacifists. There is a significantly frequent connection between Ultra Pacifism and a radical theology which denies much that the New Testament contains. The reasons for this are not far to seek, but it is not necessary here to enter upon them. The fact seems to be that the more fully one apprehends and believes the Christian Gospel, the less likely he is to be a Pacifist.

The New Testament does not preach peace at any price. It preaches righteousness at any cost. Christianity is the religion of love. But is it an evidence of love to leave one's family unprotected against brutal violence and aggression? The command to turn the other cheek expresses a great truth, but this isolated passage cannot be made the basis of a Pacifist philosophy. Are those who so use this text willing to use the same literalness in applying the words "Take no thought for the morrow." The first of these commands is as far from counselling unpreparedness as the other is from counselling improvidence.

So far is the New Testament from forbidding the use of military force and condemning the avocation of a soldier, that our Lord Jesus Christ singled out for His most pronounced commendation and held up as a special striking example to others, the brave Centurion of the Roman army, who came asking help for his sick servant.

3. Is war, however, with its attendant horrors and sufferings, so evil a thing that peace is always, and under all circumstances, to be preferred and urged? This is one of the most insiduous and dangerous teachings of Pacifism. It is insiduous because it contains some elements of truth. It is dangerous because it appeals to a true and high instinct in people, and misleads them by means of this. With a plausible and even noble sound, this teaching in reality dulls the conscience, weakens the moral judgment, and leads people to put their desire for peace above the supreme claims of righteousness and justice.

Everyone rightly desires and longs for peace. People are naturally disposed to applaud and support any measure which bears this label. War is always a frightful evil, to be avoided, prevented, eliminated, just so far as this is possible. But the vulgar saying that there never was a good war, nor a bad peace, is pernicious, sordid and untrue. There are cases in which peace is immeasurably worse than war. There are cases in which war is right and peace is wrong and shameful. There is a worship of peace which means the surrender of principle and the decay of manhood. If Pacifism meant only the desire in every way possible to remove the causes and lessen the likelihood of war, we should all be Pacifists.

But what about the Pacifism which in effect says that because war is evil, therefore all who are engaged in war, the attacked and the attackers, the wronged and the wrong doers, the oppressed and the oppressors, are on one plane and are all equally blameworthy? What about the Pacifism which with ample evidence before it, refuses to form a moral judgment or to take any position between plain right and wrong?

What about the Pacifism which has influenced our great nation, consecrated to the ideals of liberty and justice, to sit silent month after month in the face of the unspeakable deeds committed and still continuing in Belgium?

I say that this kind of Pacifism is beyond measure harmful to the soul of our people. It is as un-Christian as it is un-American. This kind of Pacifism cares more for peace than for justice and righteousness. It deadens and corrupts the moral sense. It blurs the moral judgment and leads men to shrink from facing facts in order to avoid taking a clear position in support of the right, or in condemnation of the wrong. It encourages men to stand neutral between good and evil. It robs men of the capacity for righteous indignation against wrong and so works grave injustice to the cause of right in the world.

Peace is a holy and blessed thing to be inexpressibly prized and to be preserved by every right means. But there are things which we may not sacrifice even for the sake of peace. We may not allow our desire for ease and comfort, or our dread of physical suffering and death, to lead us to make peace our supreme consideration, and if we do this as individuals, or as a nation, our moral and spiritual doom is sealed. In opposition to

this harmful sort of Pacifism we must make it clear that in certain cases the use of force is not merely justifiable, but our absolute and bounden Christian duty. We must further make it clear that it is not only permissible but our duty as Christians to be prepared in case of need to use such force in the most effective way possible. If we desire peace we must take proper measures to preserve peace. The New Testament nowhere teaches that God will do for us that which He has given us the power and the means to do for ourselves. God can perform miracles, but it is not likely that He will perform miracles to save us from the consequences of our own deliberate slothfulness and folly. General disarmament may in time be possible with an adequate world force to maintain the world's peace. We hope and are ready to work that this may come, but it has not come yet, and any nation which, with the lessons of the last two and a half years before it, fails to take adequate measures for its own defense, deserves to pray in vain, and will pray in vain, when the enemy is at the gates.

The only question with regard to Universal Training is whether this is the best and wisest military system for our country. I believe it to be the only military system which is just and wise and adequate.

Looking at the question not only from the standpoint of a citizen, but from the standpoint of a Christian, and of one whose office in the Church requires him to speak with serious and careful thought, I wish to declare my belief that physically, morally and spiritually, the adoption of Universal Military Training would be of incalculable benefit to the young men of our land.

There are some who assert that the introduction of Universal Training will develop in us that arrogant and un-American spirit which the word Militarism has come to represent. There is no ground for this assertion. It is made usually by those who are opposed not only to Militarism, but to any adequate measures for military defense. Militarism cannot thrive in a democracy. The real danger of a democracy is not that it may be carried into Militarism, but that, through its unwillingness to face the possibility of war, it may be found unable to defend itself in the day of necessity.

I advocate Universal Training because it is the most effective

system that we can adopt, the one most likely to preserve peace, and to secure our land against invasion.

I advocate it because it is the system which is fairest to all. It treats all alike. It imposes special burdens on no one and gives special privilege to none. It is the only system that is thoroughly democratic.

I advocate it because it removes the necessity for a large standing army. The idea of a huge standing army is contrary to American ideals. It has its dangers for us. Universal training will avoid these. It will give us not a vast force of professional soldiers, not a military caste, but a people trained and prepared for their own defense.

I advocate it because it will make us all realize that citizenship requires service, that service to the country is not a voluntary thing which we may give or withhold as we choose, but that each one of us owes service to the State. It will lead us to think less of what the country owes to us and more of what we owe to the country. It will develop in us the spirit of true patriotism and of reverence for the flag. It will serve as nothing else could to weld together the varied elements of our mixed population, and to knit us into one splendid whole of American life and fellowship. It will make us all true Americans without any disfiguring adjectives or divided allegiance.

And I advocate it distinctly for its moral and spiritual effects. It will give our young men the discipline that they need. It will be a great nation-wide school of training in character. It will make our young men alert, active, efficient. It will give them steadiness, orderliness, obedience to authority, respect for law. It will bring out in them those qualities which are most needed for the development of our national character. It will tend to make those who are to guide the future of our country stronger men, truer Americans and better Christians.

I advocate Universal Military Training because it will help to mould us into a great nation trained and ready for any emergency; abhorring war and prepared to maintain peace; strong in that spirit of high and true patriotism which is the very life of a people and which alone can move us to perform rightly our duties at home and to take our true place, and meet our full responsibility, as one among the family of nations, in the world of which we are a part.

CHAIRMAN MITCHEL: I have the honor of presenting to you as the next speaker the distinguished editor of the Chicago Tribune, the Congressman-elect from Chicago, whose voice was first heard in the West in support of this program, Mr. Medill McCormick. (Applause.)

MR. McCORMICK: The Mayor has confused me with my brother and my cousin, the editors of the Tribune, who first spoke the gospel of preparedness in the West. It is true that I have been elected a Congressman-at-large from Illinois—believing and preaching that doctrine—and by a majority which indicated that the people of the West are of that opinion.

THE NEED OF GOVERNMENTAL EFFICIENCY

Hon. Medill McCormick of Chicago, Representative-elect from Illinois

This is not the first time in American history when the government of the country has been unequal to the tasks which lie before it. There is a striking parallel between conditions to-day and those which governed the Republic during Washington's administration. The central government in those days was too weak. There were affairs which suffered under the regulation of the States or for lack of any governmental concern. The national revenues did not keep pace with the increasing cost of administration. The Republic was threatened by the consequences of trans-Atlantic wars. There was a grave division of American opinion over the issues of a foreign conflict. The economic life of the country was inadequately organized. The country itself was unprepared for military defense. The conditions under which our government, local and national, were organized, made for a diffusion of public authority. Mutual confidence was little developed. There was a public distrust of a powerful government. It was widely believed that the government which governed best was that which governed least. There were men who preferred American theory to the study of foreign experience—there were men who held a virgin conception of the State, sprung from the human mind, like Athene, panoplied from the head of Jove.

Today we are confronted with problems which arise from the origin of American government and which flow from foreign

circumstances over which we have no control. The world has changed; it never again can be what it was before the war. The change indeed had begun before the war and then was plain to all who cared to see; but by the war it has been accelerated, made more intense and far reaching. The consequences of the war for us are as certain, although they may not be as great as they are for the countries involved in it. With us the need, the terrible need is for public and governmental realization of the tasks laid upon us. We cannot develop our commerce, we cannot even maintain our economic security, we cannot provide for the increasing well being of the whole people, we cannot secure our own defense until the government, responsive to public opinion, acknowledges the facts and addresses itself to their consideration with equal candor and resolution. I do not speak of the military consequences of the war when I say that we are in a perilous position. That falls to the lot of other speakers. The peoples involved in the conflict have achieved a new efficiency in public administration. Their governments have extended the field of their activities to provide for the social welfare of the people and to collaborate with private enterprise. We are called upon to energize our governments from the county to the capital that they may more effectively and more economically perform the duties which now devolve upon them. We are likewise called upon to determine how far governmental activities must be extended to meet the commercial competition of a new Europe, and to conserve the vitality and happiness of our people under changing industrial conditions. It has been said that three hundred millions dollars a year is wasted in the Federal administration. If that be true, and I have no doubt that it is, not less than half a billion is wasted in public administration as a whole. While American business enterprise, in organization and results, has challenged the attention of the world we have been very little concerned with the effective organization of public affairs. Public opinion has accomplished some improvement in the administration of smaller municipalities. There has been some attempt to infuse vigor into the Federal Government, but little has been done for the better administration of counties, of metropolitan cities and of the States. We elect a veritable horde of ministerial officers, who should be appointed by the really responsible representatives

of the people. In the city of Chicago where I live, the male voter is called upon to cast his ballot for a hundred and fifty public officers in a period of six years. There we each live under the jurisdiction of half a dozen different taxing bodies; responsibility is so diffused that government would not function at all were it not for the activities of associations of private citizens—committees of vigilantes, really. Under such a system the boss must exist. He is necessary, like the citizens' committees, and his activities supplement theirs. It may be said of the multitude of elected functionaries that those whom the law divides the boss unites. Power seeks a center as water seeks its own level. If it does not reside yonder in the capitol you must seek it in Wall Street or at the White House. If you will not confer it upon the Legislature you must seek it in the lobby.

If we had not been rich in the exploitation of a new continent we could not have borne the increasing cost of government. Appropriations at Washington in round numbers have doubled within a decade. In great industrial States like New York and Illinois they have increased three-fold in the same period; appropriation and expenditure have been as casual as public administration. This is a problem not peculiar to any locality, but common to the country. At Albany and at Springfield there are ten times as many independent executive departments as there are at Washington, but who shall say that the national administration is properly co-ordinated. I do not necessarily criticize the head of the War Department when I say that the mobilization on the border proved its military inefficiency. Unable to discharge its special functions the War Department is likewise a Department of Public Works and a Colonial Department. The education of Filipinos, the health of Porto Ricans, the care of our rivers and harbors, all are added to the proper responsibilities of the Department of War. There is no single bureau of public works, although the national government builds irrigation systems, highways, post offices, levees on the rivers and breakwaters in the bays. This Congress of Patriotism has been called for a general purpose, the most important in America to-day, but I hold that we should summon another to consider the administration of the States and their subdivisions. We ought to gather from all over the country

to exchange opinions, to consult our own and foreign experiences—only so can we give impulse to the movement for a shorter ballot and a more efficient conduct of public affairs. In this way we shall go the shortest road to simple, responsible and more expert government in the States. The taxpayer (and he is everybody) must have more for his money. We cannot submit to the prodigal waste of public revenues if we are to bear the costs of the new burdens which must devolve upon us. The government at Washington cannot discharge its great and growing obligations unless those of the States are organized to perform their functions with the greatest possible efficiency at the least possible cost. Government must do better, but it also must do more. How much more cannot be determined by the mere study of Thomas Jefferson or Karl Marx. It can only be decided from year to year by the study of facts—here and throughout the world.

The functions of government must multiply with the multiplying complexities of modern life. Government must do those things which cannot be better done by its citizens. That is a tendency which cannot be stayed without imperiling the civil order. Cavour, maker of modern Italy, once remarked that some men never realize that there is a natural law no less applicable to politics than to physics—that forces compressed increase in explosive power.

But others do learn. One of the most definite opponents of the prevention of child labor by act of Congress, last year became a conspicuous though belated supporter of legislation to that end.

We now acknowledge that whatever concerns the social, economic and moral welfare of the whole people is a subject for administration by Congress. But the facts have outstripped our realization of them. America has become a manufacturing nation so rapidly that we have not appreciated the consequences of its growth. The country has become industrialized with inevitable results, social, economic and political.

Twenty-five years ago only one-fourth of those engaged in productive industry worked for wages or upon salary, and the other three-fourths owned each his own farm; each his own business or practiced each his own independent profession.

To-day a majority of those so engaged are employed in the business of others upon salaries or for wages.

We note that during the last ten years the column of manufactured exports has increased over three hundred and fifty per cent. But it is even more important to note that nearly three million women to-day are employed in industries. On their own account and on account of the children they must bear to the republic, the protection of those toiling women is of more vital concern to the country than the important pending legislation for the further encouragement of American exports. I do not argue that because the government has been derelict in caring for the toiling masses, it has been intelligently attentive to the needs of business. It has not. We are lagging behind the world in both regards. Prior to 1914 the European State concerned itself with the business success and with the social welfare of its subjects to a degree unknown to us. Now, under the compulsion of national necessity in Europe the State and the individual have become partners in important enterprises and the State has summoned to its service an unprecedented diversity of talent. State socialism is, of course, an old story in Germany. The French Prime Minister is a socialist. The British Prime Minister might very well be considered one by us conservative Americans, yet everywhere the war has called to the colors, not only to the trenches, but to serve in great administrative posts solid business men of talent; in England a grocer; in Germany a shipmaster; in France a railway executive; in Austria a banker, have assumed the most important and onerous duties.

Even before the war Germany had demonstrated an economic skill no less marvelous than her present military progress. There, merchants and manufacturers, as well as experts in social legislation sat at the council table to devise protective tariffs no less than laws for the welfare of the workers of the country. That is the sort of service our government must have. There must be new energy and new thoroughness imparted to public administration. It must call upon a greater diversity of talent in order that it may better perform its present functions—that it may carry out the new tasks which will be laid upon it.

We must assume the task of organizing and energizing

public administration; of co-ordinating the executive departments of government, of making our legislative assemblies efficient and responsive. Only then shall we justify an extension of public activities. The jealousy of government, the distrust of authority which filled the minds of the fathers, still lives. It has made political issues in this country for thirty years. Its every settlement only raises the question anew. How readily shall we abandon the individualism of our fathers to emulate the collectivism of Europe? We are, I hope, attentive enough to fact to put aside theory and to consider the economic adventures of present Europe. Somebody has said that we should be guided by the social philosophy of Jefferson and the political theory of Hamilton. The task is much more difficult. We must reconcile the social and administrative efficiency of Bismarck's government with the democracy of Abraham Lincoln's. American administration must not only do vastly better what already it does, but it must do more. How much more I do not profess to say at the moment. That is a decision which our public servants may delay and then accept, under compulsion, but which they ought to make before long. We ought boldly and carefully to consider what must be done by the National Government, for the thousands whose labor supports the agriculture and the industry of the country, and what ought to be done for the encouragement and protection of American business enterprise.

Love of country is a sentiment, a tradition, a prejudice, if you like, which lives almost everywhere, whatever the character of the government. But true loyalty, vivid, wise, inspiring man to service and to sacrifice, is quickened by the service which his government renders him. You have only to compare the devotion which the Swiss bears his republic with the patriotic apathy of the Mexican. We know that great minorities sometimes suffer such disabilities—economic or political that, when the State itself is threatened, they prefer their own immediate advancement to the safety of the State.

We have witnessed the rebellion in Ireland, the Alsatians' desertion to France, the strike of the Welsh coal miners, the Macedonian welcome to the Bulgars. A society wisely governed and justly organized would contain no such elements of

discontent. This is our problem, as well as theirs across the Atlantic. If the law is to require of every man that, in peace, he give his time to learn to fight and that in war he give his body to defend his country, then he must feel that his government meets his wants. Would you have mothers surrender their sons, would you have wives give up their husbands, then must they feel that the gift is in loving requital of the services rendered by the Government which they, themselves, help to maintain.

If I seem to emulate the pessimism of the prophet Jeremiah, it is because it is more important that we should acknowledge our shortcomings than that we should celebrate our achievements. The consciousness of the country is awakening. There is evidence that a new energy will find its way into public affairs. The organizing talent which, in 1789, penned the greatest document ever struck off by the hand of man, has been spent during these younger years in commerce and not in government. The quality of our fathers still lives.

I am not faint-hearted, because the temper and the genius which have made our commerce great, turned anew to government will infuse it with new vitality. Your thought, your talent, your energy, your fervor is summoned to the service of the people. The few who are enlisted in the career of politics can succeed only in so far as they are supported by others who make public affairs their considered avocation.

We must know that we can no longer live by plundering abundant nature in a new continent. The freighter, the wireless and the submarines have made an end of our isolation.

We must take up the burdens common to other people, the consequences, the complexities of our civilization. We must bear our share in the world's struggle. Now that the fire of democracy over yonder burns dim; now that other peoples have surrendered their liberties to fight for the common weal, as they see it, it is our part to rekindle the fire, to clothe our Government with the powers, to arm it with the policies which will secure our prosperity and which will guard our liberties. This is not a task to dismay, but to sting Americans to action. It is a challenge to whatever wisdom is bequeathed to us, to manhood, to honor.

This is no time to hesitate. This is the time to concert our purposes, to rouse our energies. How, said Shakespeare's great King Harry:

"Gentlemen in England now a-bed
Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speak
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day."

They will be glad, their children will be proud, who join with us in this new struggle.

If others hang back, let us, with steady temper, with sober courage with hard resolve, march into the breach.

CHAIRMAN MITCHEL: The Committee have asked me to announce that in view of the lateness of the hour the speaking part of this program will now close with an exhibition of the pictures of the Plattsburg Camp in action and they will consume but fifteen minutes.

Let me say this one word: We have not universal training in the United States as yet, but we have its prototype in the Plattsburg Camp. We have the beginning there and in observing the work of those camps in these pictures, you will see what universal training would be if it were extended generally to the entire citizenship of the United States.

A series of motion pictures, entitled "Plattsburg Camp In Action," exhibited under the auspices of the Military Training Camp Association, concluded the session.

SIXTH SESSION

10:15 O'clock A. M., Saturday, January 27, 1917
New Willard Hotel

PREPAREDNESS

The Sixth Session of the Congress was called to order by Harry H. Merrick, chairman of the Chicago Branch of the National Security League, who introduced the presiding officer, Albert Shaw, of New York.

MR. H. H. MERRICK: Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure for a man from Chicago—the Middle West, as we call it—to be afforded the pleasure of presiding for just a moment over this assemblage and of introducing to you, not alone a citizen of New York, but far from that, a citizen of the United States, a man who is known throughout the world as an educator, a man who has the power to carry out the purposes of this Congress in printed thought. Ladies and gentlemen, I have the pleasure of introducing S. Albert Shaw, the distinguished editor of "The Review of Reviews." (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN SHAW: Mr. Merrick, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is hardly my purpose and intention to occupy the few minutes that have been assigned to me by way of preliminary remarks. We have had eloquence and inspiration in the evening sessions of this great convention; in the day sessions you have practical work to do along the lines of the inspirational eloquence that you have heard.

Our session to-day, I understand it, is to be a very practical session. It is to have to do with the carrying out of a great conception. That great conception does not involve controversy, it does not involve argumentation. Almost all argumentation turns upon definitions; it turns upon words, it turns upon prejudices. Controversy usually means a conflict between

ignorant minds. I think we need have comparatively little controversy in the sessions of these patriotic societies that are here for the very best and highest welfare of our country. We are not here to turn America into an ominous fighting machine. We are here because we believe in our country; we believe our country is a valuable asset to the world.

We, in my business, in my profession in my kind of work, are obliged to learn that a great many different things can be true at the same time. Your boy can belong to a rifle club and be a good shot; he can belong to a militia company, he can be prepared to serve his country; he can also be a member of the New York Peace Society, if necessary. I see by the papers that I was elected a vice-president of the New York Peace Society two days ago. I shall not decline. I shall do what I can in that office, but I take my boy to Plattsburg to be trained and he is a member of the rifle club in his college and he can shoot. I could shoot in the woods when I was eleven years old, in the West. I do not think it made me dangerous; I do not think I am a menace to the welfare of the world because I have some feeling of a practical ability to defend my family, to defend my home, to defend my principles that I believe to be righteous and to be precious. (Applause.)

But we are not here to talk about general principles; we are here to talk about real things; we are to talk about constructive things; we are to talk about carrying into effect those things we believe in; those things that have to do with the continuity of our National life, perpetuation of our principles. We believe in the rule of reason, right reason in the world; we believe in justice, but we believe justice is going to be carried into effect when those who believe in righteousness are strong in the assertion of their belief. We believe in the settlement of international differences by reason, by justice, by concession, by generosity. We believe in permanent solutions rather than in solutions that are imposed by brute force. We believe in solutions that have in their very nature the elements of permanence, because they can commend themselves to the reasonable mind of mankind. None the less, we believe that weaker and developing communities are entitled to their growth and to their progress. If we believe in this fundamental principle that the Monroe Doctrine was meant to express, then

surely do we not, after the lapse of almost a century, owe it to our neighbors whose welfare the Monroe Doctrine was intended to conserve that we should assure them that we are strong enough to stand by our principles; that we are capable, that we are vigorous, that we mean to put power behind justice. Surely we mean that if we mean anything. And as we look on the distress and on the turmoil of a troubled world, with weak people trying to maintain themselves, standing for their rights —Switzerland, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, and all the rest—surely you all know that they look to the United States longingly in order to have the United States strong, the people of this country acquitting themselves like men, not for purposes of war, but for purposes of influence, because our influence is a restraining influence for the welfare of the world.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have in this country several things. In a period like this, the times in which we live, there are emergencies; and emergencies have got to be considered. There are also permanent considerations, which permanent considerations have to do with citizenship in its fullest sense, and with the training of the young; with the development of the resources of the country, with the translation of all these things into social assets.

Twenty-five or thirty years ago the New York Sun in a genial and friendly way used to call me a socialist. Why? Simply because I stood for social welfare, and the New York Sun did not quite comprehend what I meant by it. I had spent a good deal of time in Germany, a good deal of time in France; I had seen how the Germans had eliminated poverty by providing for the care and the welfare of everybody. I had seen how governments, whether in municipalities or in large areas, could be used as an agency for the welfare of the people.

I saw New York in those days comparable only to Constantinople in its misgovernment, in its unfitness to care for the people who lived within its confines. I see New York to-day under Mayor Mitchel, whom you heard last night, one of the best governed cities in the entire world. (Loud applause.) Immense progress, gentlemen, immense progress. I knew London in the days when it was disorganized and rotten; I saw London come under the influence of the London County Council, and improve and develop in its ability to serve the

interest of its mass of people. Those things are going on in the world. There are splendid things going on in the world, even in all of the countries now so unhappily at war. I believe that the best forces of the world that make for progress and for welfare can be organized and marshalled. I believe that right and justice and order can prevail in the world. I believe that co-operative activities in our own communities, in our own State and our nation, are necessary in order that we should have our part in a great forward world movement.

Now, we want to know whether the things we come together here and talk about are all for purposes of talk or whether they are for purposes of action.

This leads me to say one more word, because my friend Dr. Finley has just come in. I want to say a word on behalf of our distinguished Commissioner of Education of New York, and to tell some of you from other States what we are doing in New York that is practical and that is worth while.

The great State of New York with more than ten million people is not merely talking now about preparedness and about training. New York is really doing things along the line of aroused sentiment. I have here a booklet of the Educational Department of New York containing the general plan and syllabus for physical training in the elementary and secondary schools of the State of New York. It is one of the most remarkable and most transforming and revolutionary educational documents that ever has been printed in the history of the world, because it is not merely a project; it represents a fact; a system which is going into effect. Your boy, if he lives in New York, is already under this system. My boy of thirteen is under this system, receiving in his school physical training and development under the plan which Dr. Finley and his associates of the Military Commission of the State of New York have put into effect in accordance with the statutes of our State.

Thus we have a system already adopted, not under discussion, not in controversy, but adopted and in effect, which compels all public schools and all private schools to give every boy and girl of the age of eight years for as long a time as they continue in school, a system of physical training which has for its object, as expressed in the law, to better fit that child for citizenship in a constructive sense.

This work is now being carried out under a Physical Training Inspector, a man of great ability and great capacity. The object of the work of this Commission is to determine the lines along which physical education is to proceed in this country, for the State must meet the nation's need in training for the responsibilities of citizenship.

That is constructive in its spirit and this whole book carries out in detail the plan by which that constructive spirit can be applied to the actual training each day of the child.

In addition to that, some of you resident in other States may not know, we also have a law which requires of every boy from the age of 16 to the age of 19, at least three hours a week devoted to military training. That law has not yet gone into effect because it is awaiting the action of the Military Commission, made up of our Commissioner of Education, Dr. Finley, and the Chief Officer of our National Guard and a distinguished physician appointed by the Governor. This part of the law is awaiting final action of the Military Commission in laying out the details of the work, but it will soon be put into effect.

There were exempted under that law those young men who were engaged in work and who were not in school. It is now proposed to amend the law in such a way to make that three hours a week of training compulsory upon all young men in the State, whether in school or out of school, whether engaged in vocations, or otherwise, with an enlarged range and conception. So far as I am informed this proposed amendment is not going to meet with serious opposition in the State, and I think it is reasonable to believe that it will be adopted.

This requirement—that is, the requirement of training between the ages of 16 and 19—may in the discretion of the Military Training Commission, be met in part by such vocational training or experience as shall distinctly prepare boys of the ages named for services directly useful to the State in the maintenance of defense, the promotion of public safety, the conservation of the State's resources, or the construction and maintenance of public improvements.

There you get an enlarged purpose which is going to put a great deal more enthusiasm into you, give you a great deal better understanding of the work of the Military Commission. If this kind of training meant merely a dull routine drill, merely

practice in a manual of arms, it would be a dead thing. This is intended to appeal to the high spirit of boys in the spirit of the boy scouts, to stimulate their sense of public duty, their sense of citizenship, and of responsibility, their duty to maintain sound minds and sound bodies, combining sense of duty all the time with joy, with pleasure, making play as well as work contribute to that development that makes the citizen a servant of the State.

I say this to show you that the great State of New York is trying to find its way in doing some of this constructive work that you have gathered here to promote in your respective communities. I suggest, as one of those practical things that any of you could do in other parts of the country, that you obtain from the Department of Education at Albany, copies of the New York laws, and copies of the specifications that are to be worked out for training in the New York schools, in order to see if it might not be advisable in your State, and in other States of the Union, to adopt a similar system. In other words, why not get right down to business with these things and not wait.

The first speaker on our program to-day is Mr. Herbert Myrick, President of the Orange-Judd Company of Springfield, Mass. Mr. Myrick is one of the great leaders of agricultural education in this country, a great publisher of agricultural journals circulated all over the United States, a man of great authority in many fields of thought and action, but particularly a man informed about agricultural conditions and the whole farm life and business of the people of this country. Mr. Myrick.

AGRICULTURE AND PREPAREDNESS

Herbert Myrick, President Orange-Judd Co., Springfield, Mass.

God is infinite, Nature His finite expression, Agriculture the means whereby we humans utilize His mysteries for the support of life and its evolution.

Hence, Agriculture is life. It employs the vital elements—soil, water, air—to create the food that sustains life. It affords the environment which best fits youth for the struggle of existence. It fosters all those factors that develop in men and women strength of body, firmness of will, capacity for effort, level-headedness of mind, vigor of purpose, power of spirituality—factors that underly human efficiency.

Therefore, Agriculture is the State. It does more than feed the world. It perpetually renews the virile human stream which otherwise constantly would weaken in the cities, "where wealth accumulates and men decay."

Agriculture is the insurance of the human race, country life the best nursery. The direct grapple with Nature on land or sea strengthens character with each obstacle it overcomes. To wrest food and clothing directly from Nature herself stimulates honest endeavor. And one primary principle of character is *endeavor*. For the *will* to do, is vastly more vital than achievement, however glorious!

Because agriculture makes for physical, mental and spiritual strength, it is at the basis of human conservation. The breeding and rearing of normal humans and their development into capable men and women being the basis of the State, its first duty is to conserve, encourage and promote the agriculture which makes this possible. Here is the very root of "preparedness."

MEN AND MECHANISMS.

The fundamental purpose of organized humanity, which is the State's expression, should be a more perfect agriculture, with all that this implies. To make farming the best business, country life the best existence, rural training the best education, the farming community an epitome of all that is best in civics and religion, science and art, is to make for national stability in peace and for national safety in war.

Partly because our country folk sense these truths, they have shown no hysteria over such phases of preparedness as armies and navies. These come last, not first—they are effects, not causes.

We must have men before we can have soldiers, machines before we can have armament. The Great War has emphasized, what the struggles of peace previously had shown, that man-power is the main thing. Perhaps I should say human-power, for woman-power is to have equal place with man-power in the immediate future of civilization. Indeed the number, character and representation of women in this Congress is its most significant feature, and their part in constructive patriotism now vies with man's.

Yet this is the mechanical age, in war as in peace. With astonishing ingenuity the principles of mechanics are now being newly employed in warfare. It fairly may be inquired whether our own army and naval staffs are fully alive always to the possibilities of new mechanisms for destructiveness.

Taxpayers are urged to provide millions for multiplying *present* types of armament for land, sea or air, but is enough encouragement promptly extended to the creators of new, original and more powerful engines of defense and offense? The novel design for a submarine which possibly may inaugurate a new naval epoch, should at least have had a fair hearing instead of being pushed into the hands of another power that may so employ it as even to win for autocracy the present world fight for democracy.

However, every day demonstrates anew the superiority of man to the machines he creates. One need in agriculture is to instruct the older generation in mastery of the new machines. Farm youth must be taught applied mechanics and agricultural engineering. Lands must be fitted for machinery operated by mechanical power, just as our fathers fitted their fields for the mowing machine. It is the motor age in agriculture as in other vocations.

THE PROBLEM OF DISTRIBUTION.

Better transportation, better distribution, better marketing of agricultural products are prerequisites to any form of preparedness. Even by present all too crude methods, farmers usually produce more than they can sell at a satisfactory profit. They rightly contend for a larger share of what consumers pay. Naturally enough, farmers are more interested in getting a better profit for what they do raise, than to produce more and get less for it!

The systematizing of agricultural distribution is the need of the hour. Although the United States always has been premier as a cotton producer, it is only within a few years that standards of quality for cotton have been authoritatively established here, while the assembling, covering, storing and shipping of this staple is yet disgracefully inefficient, as a whole, though somewhat improved recently at certain centers.

The Federal grain standards law of 1916 needs to be applied in principle to other non-perishable crops. The purposes of the federal warehouse law of last year must be universally worked out and used before the farmer may enjoy adequate seasonal credits. One of its features will be cold storage plants in the country instead of in cities where charges are so much higher.

CREDIT INSTRUMENTS BASED ON AGRICULTURE

The live stock and dairy industries, in all their branches, need to be organized and co-ordinated so that the paper instrument which expresses the producers' valid interest therein shall be as cashable as the commodity it represents.

This must be done simply and cheaply yet safely, in marked contrast to the present clumsy, complicated and costly methods of creating and marketing cattle paper. Present unscientific methods with cattle paper are designed primarily to fatten such two-legged kine as lawyers, note-shavers, brokers and bankers, rather than to enable the farmer to fatten four-legged creatures, and to breed and feed more live stock.

Apply scientific principles to the employment as a basis for credit instruments of live stock or its produce, also crops and food products, and the use of these credits will become as universal as is commercial paper. The result will be that the banker may then profit more by a little return on many pieces of such paper than by a bigger profit on fewer transactions now. The smaller the bank and the fewer its transactions, the less its service, the smaller its profits and the greater the cost to its customers. Hence, big banks and their legalized co-operation through the federal reserve system.

Commodities en route to the consumer are on the basis of the new American currency afforded by the federal reserve system, supplemented by liberal reserves of gold. Above all other commodities, food is the best basis of credit because consumers must have it, and to get it they must pay for it. Instead of a system whereby the producer is first to profit from this economic axiom, too often the farmer is obliged to accept what is left after all the intermediaries between him and the consumer have taken their toll.

The number of these middlemen is legion, their ingenuity boundless, their toll levied and collected with an individual and

organized efficiency that only needs to be properly re-directed to solve the age-old problems of economic distribution. These conditions are to be reformed as a foundation for preparedness.

PERSONAL OR SHORT-TERM CREDITS AND PETTY SAVINGS

Facilities whereby the individual farmer may mobilize his personal assets as a basis for seasonal credits, should be supplemented by associated effort to mobilize the individual character and responsibility of the collective rural community as a basis for current loans, current thrift and current savings. No adequate method for doing this has yet been devised. The nearest approach to it is the Massachusetts Credit Union law.

Commercial bankers are groping into this field, with their inducements for small deposits. Too often this is merely a new variation of old schemes for getting other people's money and paying for it as little as possible. Few American bankers yet realize the opportunity for both profit and service that lies in making small loans. They may not know that a goodly fraction of the business done by the Bank of France is in its thousands of loans of 100 francs—about $20.

Some bankers prefer to pay a bonus to the Morris system and to participate in its 8 per cent. to 15 per cent. profits screwed out of borrowers who don't know how to mobilize the asset represented by their personal integrity. Relatively few banks as yet employ the reserve system's machinery for the accomodation of farmers.

PEOPLE'S CO-OPERATIVE FEDERAL BANKS

Savings and thrift need to be encouraged quite as much as to provide short term or seasonal credits. Probably no existing commercial bank can get at this problem in the "human," personal-interest, self-help, co-operative-spirit way that is required to solve it. As I have elsewhere said:

> "Character is the basis of exchange—
> Not gold, land, labor, nor within the range
> Of what men call property.
>
> "The instrument is good or bad
> According as the man is glad,
> And able promise to perform.

"But this means organization
To effect the transmutation
Of brain and hand, work and desire,
Into forms that others require."

It may yet appear that some modification and association of the credit union plan with the postal savings system will prove to be most helpful. The widest and wisest use of that which already exists may make for economic efficiency better than new schemes. Instead of multiplying more agencies, why not employ more fully what already exists?

Let the postal savings system become universal throughout the rural districts, its funds partly used for small short-time or seasonal loans to worthy borrowers, adequately secured by indorsement of the local people's co-operative federal bank. Let it pay the postoffice the same interest as national banks—2½ per cent., upon the same security—government and state bonds, or federal farm loan bonds—and there will be a margin of profit sufficient to make the plan stable. This suggestion will not be popular with national banks, but they cannot afford to antagonize it, even if from a narrowly selfish standpoint a few might be so disposed.

HOW THE POSTOFFICE MAY HELP

The postal service is yet in the infancy of its usefulness to agriculture. At a profit to itself, it should find the consumer who wishes to buy produce direct, deliver it to him, collect the money for it, and remit to the farmer, or vice versa with reference to what the farmer wishes to buy.

Instead of seeking to destroy farm periodicals, newspapers and magazines by imposing confiscatory rates, let every postmaster and carrier receive and transmit subscriptions at a fixed percentage, all of which shall go into the postal treasury. Have a newsstand in every postoffice where not only publications of the second class may be sold, but also such few public documents as the people may desire to buy. If that dreary stuff is priced at merely the cost of manufacture and distribution, the copies sold will be so few as enormously to reduce the amount of public printing. Let the postoffice be the nation's errand boy for the sale of public documents, not grave and reverend senators or busy representatives. Confine the franking privilege to its original

function; withdraw it from thousands of county and state institutions that now flood the mails.

In these and other ways the government may *save a million dollars a week,* yet give farmers and the public better service.

A postcard order form and remittancer for sums of $1 or less would be a universal convenience and a profit maker for the service. It is disgraceful that no handy way is provided for remitting petty sums by mail, except gummy stamps, or inconvenient and costly postal orders. The ridiculousness of it is shown by the fact that if you send Uncle Sam ten cents for a couple of five cent documents, and he has only one in stock, he retains the other five cents and sends you a credit slip for it, evidently because even he himself has no simple means of mailing it back to you! Yet if a private publisher thus held back customer's balances, he might be indicted for obtaining money under false pretenses!

ENCOURAGING REFORM IN LONG-TERM CREDITS

As to long-term farm mortgage credits, an admirable beginning has been made by the federal farm loan act. It provides a method under national supervision whereby farmers may cooperate to obtain long-time farm mortgage loans at reasonable rates upon easy terms of repayment.

This is done through national farm loan associations composed of borrowing farmers. These unite in federal land banks, which cash the first mortgages on the borrower's farm. Against such mortgages the banks issue federal farm loan bonds free of all tax, affording an attractive investment. The sale of these bonds furnishes additional funds to loan. The whole system is directed by the federal farm loan board.

The system assists present or prospective farm owners to the additional capital their business requires. Each loan is secured by farm land worth at least twice as much as the total sum loaned, plus buildings thereon insured for five times as much as is loaned upon them. The farmer's mortgage note is indorsed by his incorporated "local." At agreed upon intervals, he pays to the local his dues, sufficient to cover interest and gradually to liquidate principal. This constantly increases the equity back of each mortgage, and correspondingly enhances the security behind the bonds.

Federal farm loan bonds, secured by first mortgages on farms worked and occupied by their owners who are expert in practical farming, unite every attribute desired by the conservative investor: Safety, stability, marketability, principal and interest absolutely free from taxation, increasing equity back of the bonds, all combined with a fair rate of interest.

UNIVERSAL EFFORT FOR THRIFT

Being in denominations as small as $25, $50 and $100—as well as $500 and $1000 for larger buyers—these little bonds are in reach of the masses. They even may be bought on the installment plan by petty deposits at 4 per cent. in the locals, exchangeable for bonds at par.

While these securities should be snapped up quickly by prudent investors, trustees, estates, institutions and executors, my hope is that the masses will put their little savings into federal farm loan bonds instead of into wildcat schemes or visionary speculations. The money now lost annually to the people each year by gambling in cotton, grain or stocks, unfortunate investments or by lack of thrift, if put into these bonds secured by first mortgages on farms right in the community whence the savings emanate, will be sufficient gradually to make the land blossom as the rose. The money will be used over and over in upbuilding agricultural and therefore all other local industries, thus creating an endless chain of thrift and prosperity throughout each community.

A mass meeting with this purpose in view, at each of the nearly 3000 shire towns in the United States, has been called for this very day and hour—perhaps the first time in American history that all the people in all the counties have had a chance to come together at the same time to consider the same subject—a universal application of the good old New England town-meeting idea, "the best form of self-government ever devised."

If this principle of thrift savings for farm development is nurtured persistently by the locals—which the new federal law calls national farm loan associations—it will do more than train farmers in business and the masses in thrift.

It will transform the American people from a nation of depositors into a nation of investors.

It will apply permanently to farming and cognate industries much of the depositors' millions now employed in manipulation on the exchanges.

It will tend to equality of opportunity in country as compared to town, on farm as in factory, in the rural home as in the city office.

It will stabilize business, minimize loss, diffuse wealth. It will help to bring about the ideal economic condition that offers youth a fair chance, and insures adults 4 or 5 per cent. interest absolutely net and without risk to principal.

THE PURPOSE OF FARM FINANCE

The purpose of farm finance is to put the farming business on a business basis. To enable farmers to pay cash for what they buy, whether they buy separately or co-operatively. To enable them to save much of the costs of the present ancient and uneconomic system whereby the local dealer "carries" the farmer, the jobber carries the dealer, the wholesaler carries the jobber, the manufacturer carries the wholesaler, and the farmer pays for it all.

The farmer's ability to pay spot cash will go far toward economy all along the line. He should be able to earn or save the necessary cash, or to borrow it direct from his own bank at a fraction of the charges involved in the present system.

The ability to market his stuff to better advantage, whether individually or collectively, is another elementary phase of agricultural preparedness which farm finance aims to serve. This brings us to the problem of farm tenantry, and to the object lesson thereof afforded by our neighboring republic.

THE CHALLENGE OF MEXICO

That most brilliant Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, "discovered the countries to the south of us," in the modern politico-economic sense. He laid the foundation upon which is being reared the Pan-American Union. At this moment, its A. B. C. nations only need a little coaxing to join with the United States in bringing order out of the chaos in Mexico.

I have no patience with Mr. Taft's flippant declaration that "Mexico is an international *nuisance*." Mexico is a *challenge* to the Pan-American Union to enforce peace in the Western hemi-

sphere! Let us make a good job of it, before tackling the Pandora's box of Old World troubles.

Indeed, Pan-American peace successfully established *now,* will go far toward inducing the nations of the Eastern hemisphere to adopt forthwith those eternal American principles whose authoritative enunciation in this historic week may be crystallized into two words—the *Wilson doctrine!* A doctrine that may yet bring about the realization of my new-year wish to certain friends—that 1917 may prove to be "the Year One of the Great Peace."

For by its control of so much of the world's supply of food and fiber, metals and forests, and by its capacity for absorbing so large a proportion of the exportable surplus of European manufactures, the sheer economic weight of the Pan-American Union, added to its ideals of human liberty, may almost compel the Old World to keep the peace in self-defense!

Secretary Blaine and Sir John Macdonald were right also in their personal agreement that closer trade relations between Canada and the States, with the same tariff against the rest of the world, would mutually advantage both countries. To-day, that zollverein might well include the whole Western hemisphere —as an insurance of economic peace around the world following the cessation of arbitrament by arms.

THE CURSE OF FARM TENANTRY

The situation in Mexico is due primarily to the 6000 overlords who own all the land that their 15,000,000 fellows covet with an intensity not paralleled among any other people. The increasing extent of farm tenantry here in the United States must and shall be reformed before it assumes Mexican proportions.

Here, it is a result partly of shameless exploitation, partly of our deficient economic system. The tenants on American farms must have a fair chance to become farm owners. Tenants are actually and relatively most numerous in Texas, whose homestead exemption law has deprived them largely of the credit asset represented by a valid first mortgage on the farm occupied and cultivated by its owning family. An amendment to the Texas constitution is one remedy there. Better land laws may help other tenant-ridden states.

Farm tenantry may be relieved safely and rapidly by private, corporate or state agencies to market second mortgages on farms. The tenant who has the makings of a fairly successful farmer, may acquire by working for others or by farming on shares some equipment and money for operating expenses, but usually lacks some or all of the capital to buy a farm. Probably a million or so of our nearly 7,000,000 farmers got started in this manner.

The new federal farm loan system affords a means whereby the tenant may obtain, on long time at reasonable interest and upon easy terms of repayment, on first mortgage, 50 per cent. of the value of the farm plus 20 per cent. of the insured value of its buildings. He could give a second mortgage on the premises for so much of the balance of the purchase price as he may not have the cash to meet, and can afford to pay for such accommodation at a rate that will make it an attractive investment.

Land sellers should willingly accept these second mortgages in part payment. Bonds issued against them and guaranteed by a responsible trust company will be attractive to investors who want a larger income than is afforded by underlying first-lien securities.

THE BACK-TO-THE-LANDERS

Another problem is that of the urban family who hanker to get back to the land. Too often the aspirations of this class are excelled only by their utter ignorance of farming, and their inherent lack of adaptiveness to country life.

The expert workman in all the delicacies of a watch factory feels entirely competent to farm, but fails to realize how equally ridiculous it would be for a farmer to assume the job of watch making without sufficient preparation!

No class have given more gratuitous advice to farmers than a certain type of city bankers, whose ignorance of agriculture is notorious, and who only since the federal reserve act have begun to grasp the science of their own business of finance and to realize the beneficent possibilities of exchange.

Adult would-be beginners, who lack technical knowledge and practical experience in farming, easily can make good this lack, with profit to themselves and at others' expense. Let them work out a season, a year or a term, for one or more of the many successful farmers who now are at their wits' end for help. The

city man working under such tutelage, his wife working in the farmer's household, his children going to the rural school when not busy about the farm or in the garden, will gain experience that insures success on a farm of their own if their enthusiasm withstands this acid test. If their interest dies out, it usually will be because they are not fitted for farm life, and are almost certain to fail if they persist in it. The test will have benefitted the whole family, even if they return to urban life.

LAND DEVELOPMENT

This whole problem of the land now takes on new phases. Foremost is how to employ more fully the land already in farms. Next is how to render wild land and public land so available to settlers that they can work out their own salvation.

Inflation of land values, as of stock-market quotations, have accompanied abnormal increases in prices of labor and commodities. Some deflation is inevitable. But the cost of improving wild land, and other conditions incident to living upon and profiting by it, are so changed from formerly, that here also a new deal is called for.

The modern agricultural engineer should lay out a new agricultural country with the same thoroughness and foresight that a new city is now planned, or a new suburb laid out for an old city. Country planning is more needed than city planning, not only in new regions but in old—two quite different propositions, however.

That part of the public domain which it is proposed to settle up, should be equipped in advance of settlement with roads, schools, transportation, markets. Each homestead should be provided with a set of farm buildings. The improvements being all made at wholesale pursuant to a definite plan, large economies would result. Settlers could well afford to contract to pay a price that should yield a profit above cost. This would avoid some of the long years of heartrending trials, not to mention scandals, that have beset settlers under homestead, even upon irrigation projects.

The Californian commission on land colonization and rural credits suggests a scheme for applying this idea under state auspices. The ever-present danger in state socialism lies in mismanagement by incapable officials or by designing grafters.

Private enterprise, under the management of experienced operators, now contemplates extensive developments upon large tracts in various regions, so as to offer any settler the choice of an environment that will best suit him and his family. These areas are to be laid out as suggested, the 160-acre homesteads to be fully equipped with home, barn, fences, etc. Beef, mutton and pork are to be encouraged, and a ready market provided therefor.

For those poor in purse or lacking in farm experience, yet determined to get a place of their own, a 10-acre or 20-acre homecroft may be provided adjacent to a larger homestead. The crofter may work for the larger farmer, thus learning and earning while improving his ability to pay for his own little place. To finance the scheme, first mortgages will cover cost of improvements, to be marketed through a trust company or usual channels. The seller accepts a second mortgage for so much of the purchase price as the settler may be unable to pay down.

SQUARE DEALING IN LAND SETTLEMENT

Any plan must afford settlers a fair chance to earn their own farm, through their own well-directed efforts, meanwhile enjoying reasonably livable conditions. No gift scheme, no charity, no philanthropic impracticability for placing on the land folks who ought not to be there, but some help for self-help on a basis that should mutually profit all concerned.

State and nation have a grave duty here. The family that succeeds at farming is an asset; that fails, a liability. A newcomer to an old section or to a newly developed region, should not be swindled into paying 50 per cent. to 300 per cent. more than the true worth of the farm he acquires. Neither he nor the present farmers should be plucked, robbed and "skinned" unmercifully by local usurers or other exploiters.

Apply to farm development the ideals of truth, integrity and square dealing that to-day are the secrets of success in modern business. The late Orange Judd enjoys the unique distinction of having originated, away back in 1857, the policy of truth in advertising. Later came the publisher's guarantee that each advertiser in his periodical is reliable. Stewart, the merchant prince, was first to announce, "Your money back if not satisfied."

To-day the Golden Rule is the practice of legitimate business, because it pays in cash as well as in satisfaction. In the best managed business now virtue gets its own reward both materially and spiritually!

The Golden Rule may be applied to farm real estate promotion in a way that shall rid this industry of past abuses, yet make it safer and more satisfactory to owner, vendor and buyer.

State and nation must each do its part. Let the state be able to certify to the truth of representations made about the lands within its borders, and to guarantee the titles.

Let nation furnish at least a fairly accurate and comprehensible description of its land offerings. Because the General Land office never did so in former years, is no excuse for now continuing its inadequate service in this respect. Uncle Sam ought to be the most up-to-date developer of land settlement propositions, instead of being the most antiquated and least satisfactory.

FULLER USE OF OLD LANDS

Not until farm revenues still further increase will come the fuller use of now idle lands in the older states. Some theorists bemoan as though land idleness were synonymous with shiftlessness. Whereas the true reason lies in some of the causes already touched upon or others that might be mentioned, all of which may be summed up in the words unprofitable or ignorance.

The brains, labor and capital required to work now idle lands often are not available upon terms that will make the operation profitable. Less frequently is the land idleness due to lack of knowledge.

In the older states, farming becomes more and more complicated. Laws and regulations, inspectors and inspections, harass the farmer until at times he hardly knows "where he is at." Offices and officials multiply, bureaus and bureaucrats conflict—the farmer supports them all!

The relations between federal, state and local farm agencies are so increasingly complex as to generate increasing friction. Only last week the University of Illinois severed its co-operative relations with the United States Department of Agriculture. The federal grants for post roads, and now for vocational educa-

tion, add still more to the problem as to which authority shall dominate—federal, state or local.

EDUCATION

It is an evident truth that education must always be kept close to and in direct control of the people themselves. In agriculture, education is needed more and more. Agriculture even is being introduced into the schooling of city children. City schools in gardening and farming may prove helpful to town-bred youth, but the best laboratory of agriculture is practical work for a practical farmer who asks no employee to work harder than he does! The ability to work hard at hard work, along with the desire to do such work well and beautifully, are two secrets of success in life which agriculture teaches better than any other vocational training.

Indeed, the rural school is to be vastly superior to the most expensively taught and lavishly equipped city institution, because the theory taught in the country school may be supplemented by practice on the farm and in the home. It is a curious commentary on certain educators that, instead of seeking sensible means for thus hitching up school, home and farm, they unwisely seek to apply city methods to country schools. This is on a par with the common habit of creating more highly paid officials to try new schemes at taxpayers' expense, instead of seeking to make better use of that which we have so long possessed.

TAXATION

This matter of the piling up of taxes comes right home to every farmer. He knows that all wealth comes out of the ground, and out of the seas, and from labor. All taxes are borne by the farmer, miner and worker—in the last analysis. Apparently to exempt him from certain direct taxes, does not deceive the farmer. He knows that indirectly he must pay the taxes, in higher prices for everything he uses and higher wages for employees. The city press that jibes at exempting the farmer from the new 8 per cent. direct federal tax on excess profits, sees only the top, not the bottom, of the problem.

Because ultimately he bears so large a share of the public burden, the farmer is deeply concerned about public expenditure. He is aghast at civic extravagance, dismayed over the

absence of scientific management in public administration. He can't understand why millions are squandered on federal buildings at crossroads, while the Department of Agriculture is mulcted for rentals right here in Washington a sum sufficient to provide it with the permanent quarters its work requires. The farmer has protested in vain against the free seed abuse. He opposes the extravagance of river-and-harbor appropriations, though he favors waterway improvement under an efficient system.

If the government now fails to systematize, simplify and economize, then farmers, laborers and the toiling masses will return a Congress that may go to the other extreme in carrying out their radical platform for a drastic reduction in waste and loss, expense and taxes.

THE SIN OF WASTEFULNESS

in public administration as in personal affairs, must give way to habits of thrift, especially with reference to agriculture, before adequate preparedness is insured. Conservation of waters and forests, their wise and full use, are big problems about which there has been big talk. We Americans sometimes are prone to talk big and do little in such matters. The worst waste of stable manure, the worst washing away of fertility, occurs on the farm of a gentleman gifted as an orator upon conservation! It is so easy to preach, so hard to practice. The waste of plant food on farms is equaled only by the relatively greater waste of fertility in cities.

To buy the amount of fertility in the wasted food and excreta of the American people probably would cost annually five or ten times as much as the product of our whole fertilizer industry. Most of this fertility is worse than lost—it is washed through sewers into the rivers and oceans, polluting the waters and spreading disease.

The decline of her empire dated from the completion of Rome's great sewer, that carried off the fertility which before had been returned to the nearby lands. To-day, American cities are still more wasteful, for in addition to washing away their sewage, they now burn their garbage, which should yield a net revenue yearly of at least one dollar per capita, if transformed into meat and manure via the all-hog route.

The income modern Berlin derives from the sale of its sewage to farmers for manure and irrigation, pays interest on the investment and is slowly amortizing the principal. Greater New York's sewage and garbage disposal costs millions annually, and wastes plant and animal food to a possible value of $50,000,000 a year!

INDEPENDENCE IN FERTILITY AND EXPLOSIVES

We must not only conserve human, animal and plant food, but the United States should be so placed as not to rely entirely upon plant food elements imported from foreign lands. It is humiliating as well as costly to have relied so largely upon potash imported from Germany.

It is even worse now that we have to depend partly upon Chilean nitrates for explosives in war or peace, or as a source of agricultural nitrogen. The proposed government plant to extract nitrogen from the air, comes not a moment too soon. Yet even it is opposed by certain interests that are anxious to maintain high prices for their ammonium sulphate by-product. All the nitrogen that can be obtained from all sources, plus the imported supply, is none too much for the ever-increasing needs of agriculture and the arts.

The military need for nitrogen is still more acute. Not long since the entire supply of powder in the United States was hardly enough for three hours' use at the colossal rate of consumption employed in modern warfare. The rapid-firing gun of to-day, operated at full capacity by ten men, consumes daily all the explosives that can be produced by 500 men in a well equipped powder manufactory. Why talk so glibly about more guns on land and sea, yet neglect to provide them with powder and with explosive ammunition made from domestic-produced nitrogen?

Fortunately we have in the Tennessee Valley an amazing array of natural resources essential to the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen in a form available for explosives, and also available for plant food when combined with lime or phosphorous. And at Muscle Shoals are dam sites capable of developing nearly 150,000 *more* horse-power than the hydro-electric energy now utilized at Niagara Falls upon the American and Canadian sides combined. Such ample power at low cost is essential to air nitrate fixation.

At Muscle Shoals, the economical development of hydro-electric energy will at the same time remove the last obstacle to unimpeded navigation of the Tennessee River from the Ohio to above Knoxville, a distance of over 600 miles. This will open up to cheap transportation by water of the almost virgin area above Muscle Shoals—an empire nearly half the size of England, possessing vast and undeveloped resources.

THE HELP QUESTION

must be solved before this country can be said to be "prepared" industrially or in a military sense. Here again the Great War has created new conditions so suddenly and so far-reaching that Congress has not yet waked up to them. It again seeks to apply the literacy test to immigrants, not realizing that our job now is two-fold: (1) to retain the immigrants who already are here, and (2) to obtain as many more as can properly be attracted from old empires denuded of their blood by the most ruthless, most inexcusable and most wicked conflict in human history.

Expert inquiry shows that probably half a million aliens now here will return to Europe within a year or 18 months after peace is consummated. They may take with them some $300,000,000. We can spare the money, but not the men. Duty and self-interest demand new, instant, comprehensive and efficient effort to transform these aliens into citizens, and to locate permanently on the land such of them as possess an aptitude for farming as a result of earlier experience.

I have never recognized the immigrant's ability to read and write as a main qualification for admission to the United States. To the many restrictions now imposed for the exclusion of undesirables, possibly might be added a vocational test, so that upon arrival the immigrant might be assigned to the occupation for which he is best fitted.

However, all inquiry now emphasizes the probable dearth of immigration into the United States, at least for some years to come. Even allowing for a slacking up in industry during the approaching readjustment, the tide of labor that will emigrate is certain to perpetuate if not accentuate the present scarcity of farm help. The country's first duty in this crisis is to induce Congress to sustain the President's impending veto of the literacy test.

It would be constructive patriotism of the highest order for this Conference to adopt a resolution urging the Congress to sustain the righteous attitude of the present Chief Executive and of his predecessor upon this all-important subject.

This policy is directly related to both economic and military preparedness. Our present relatively small navy is grossly undermanned; the same is true of our inadequate army. Anything that curtails the labor supply, will diminish correspondingly the proportion of men available for defense on land or sea—speakingly broadly,, in an economic sense as well as from the military point of view.

THE INHERENT WEAKNESS

with respect to farm labor, is that agriculture does not furnish steady employment the year around, except for a comparatively small proportion of the hired help regularly employed. This situation may be improved by the development of rural industries. These should supply work during the winter for labor that otherwise will flock to town.

Farming itself may be so reorganized as to give more steady employment throughout the twelve months. Cheaper electric power, associated buying of raw materials and of selling the finished products, will be helpful to the rural factory. Many a person in the country districts is idle more or less of the time during the six winter months, who would be only too glad to work in a local industry, or employ their spare time working for it in their own home.

Here is an immense field for economic cultivation. It now lies fallow partly because of the concentration of manufacturing into fewer hands and larger concerns. That tendency is one of numerous economic changes the results of which may be far more serious than appear on the surface. When so many women and children do no work at all, and when even farm labor yearns for the eight-hour day, is it any wonder that production is restricted and prices unduly enhanced?

Let us beware lest our standard of living be raised on a false foundation. It should be fashionable to work, unfashionable to loaf. To deny children from 6 to 16 the privilege of learning to do by doing, on the farm, in the home or in neighborhood industries, is to deny them of their birthright. If these formative

years pass without learning how to work, without acquiring habits of industry, without developing grit, persistency, pluck, determination, fearlessness, the youth is hampered indeed. On the other hand, let these formative years be rich in the variety of experience and training such as farm life affords, the natural bent of the child will be revealed, and it may then be trained along the line of its special capacity.

CO-OPERATION

It is now clear that preparedness in agriculture, preparedness all the way up to the military, involves more perfect co-ordination of our matchless human, natural, economic and social resources. For, as I have elsewhere written:

"Now we discern, amid the warfare of aggressive Individualism, ruthless Capitalism and extreme Socialism, the strong figure of Co-operation advancing to the front. His majestic mien, his masterful bearing, his confidence-imparting atmosphere, withal his modesty and sympathy, humanity and spirituality, inspire in every man and woman the conviction that Co-operation is the great leader who will conduct them to the promised land. But the people quickly learn from this leader that they can never reach the goal except through their own individual efforts, supplemented by associated effort in doing those things which can be done better by people working together rather than separately.

"Just as you dimly feel the latent powers inherent within yourself that are seeking expression, so are there powers inherent but latent in the mass which are seeking an outlet. Just as these powers in the individual grow by use, education and experience, until he may accomplish the seemingly impossible, so do the powers of co-operation develop by use, training and wisdom.

"When you know how, it is so easy to do anything, whether individually or collectively! The inefficient methods of the past give way to the efficient processes of the future. Past theories become obsolete in the light of modern experience. Old issues naturally wither and die in the bright sunshine of the new era."

What before was complicated, now becomes simple. We begin to comprehend—that righteous co-operation is the application of spirituality to the business of life; that it doth not avail a man,

an industry or a nation, to gain the whole world but lose his own soul! That live and let live is the keynote to preparedness—for, as I have written:

"Co-operation—not strife,
Is the divine law of life!

Not to stand alone is vital
Get together is immortal:
Instead of weakness, separately,
Strength in oneness with Infinity—
For every soul
Is part of the Whole!"

IN MEMORY OF THE LATE ADMIRAL DEWEY

MR. TEITLEBAUM, of San Antonio, Texas: May I take the opportunity now to suggest that the National Security League honor itself in honoring the memory of the hero of Manila Bay, Admiral Dewey. To that end I move that the Chair appoint a committee of four with instructions to draft suitable resolutions on the loss of the nation and proper condolence to his family. The Committee also to be instructed to report when it is ready and to interrupt any deliberations that may be before the body at the time.

CHAIRMAN SHAW: May I suggest before that motion is seconded that you be so kind as to put it in writing and procure a second and permit me to refer it to the standing officers and have them refer it to their Committee on Resolutions. I am sure that we are all in entire sympathy with your resolution and that that process would result in just the thing that you desire.

MR. TEITLEBAUM: I am sorry that it was not one of the first orders of business. I did not think it was necessary to go through that preliminary, but I will be very glad to do so.

CHAIRMAN SHAW: My function is just to preside over this particular session of this particular program, but there is a standing committee on resolutions, who, doubtless, will be in entire sympathy with your suggestion, and if you will put your suggestion in writing, it will be duly referred to the Resolutions Committee. I am sure that your resolution is regarded by everyone as admirable. Will you consent to that?

MR. TEITLEBAUM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SHAW: I shall be very glad to have it referred to the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions in that way. I am sure that would be the wish of the assemblage. (Applause.)

I have the honor now to present to you as the next speaker, Mr. Howard E. Coffin, of Detroit. Mr. Coffin is so well known in his great profession of engineering that he requires very few words from me. But officially, Mr. Coffin is now Chairman of the Committee on Industrial Preparedness of the Naval Consulting Board.

Mr. Coffin has with great unselfishness, and, in my opinion, great patriotism, and with a very high and large conception, devoted all his time and energy for a good while past to the organization of the most modern and the most efficient profession we have in the United States—the profession of engineering. Forty or fifty thousand engineers have been brought into sympathy with the idea that the mechanical resources of this country and the engineering talents of this country can be organized in such a way as to make all our marvelous manufacturing and industrial resources effective for the service of the country in time of peace. The conception is a great one; the execution of that conception is a work of organizing that requires the highest talents, very great experience, much tact, and a marvelous amount of voluntary co-operation along with high official encouragement. This work Mr. Coffin has been engaged in doing, first with voluntary co-operation with the engineers, and then with the recognition of the government, so that his work has been taken over as a part of the defense program of the Navy Department here at Washington, with the express co-operation and approval of the President.

I imagine the thing you want to hear from Mr. Coffin is not a defense of that conception at all, but practical information as to how they are proceeding to carry this into effect. We know, for example, as we read in the papers, that the British Government, now in control of the industrial life of that country, is producing more ammunition in every forty-eight hours than they were able to produce the first year of the war. That means a marvelous marshalling of resources, a very high development of co-operative efficiency. If we, through some very great misfortune, should be assailed, we should be obliged to rely upon the

mechanical, the manufacturing, and the industrial ability of this country very greatly. If it is not organized in advance, it will be a very long time before it could be made efficient.

Let me present to you, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Coffin. (Applause.)

ADDRESS

Mr. Howard E. Coffin of Detroit, Chairman Committee on Industrial Preparedness, Naval Consulting Board; Member Advisory Committee, Council of National Defense

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Congress: The tip has just been passed along to me diplomatically, as these tips are usually passed along, that inasmuch as the program of the three days meeting is getting hopelessly jammed, that I be most speedy and brief. I hope that you will pardon me, therefore, if some of the things I may say may seem somewhat disconnected, and if I read to you certain things that I think will convey to your mind perhaps more quickly than any other way a conception of the size of the industrial problems which confront us, and the means which we are taking to solve these problems. Before I pass on to this subject, however, there is one thing of very great importance which I think I should touch upon. I understand that during the meetings of the last two days several committees representing various patriotic and defense and civic organizations, have been in session with a view to determining whether or not it will be possible to co-ordinate and to concentrate the efforts of these bodies in such a way that under one board of directors, if you like, there will be provided the machinery through which co-operative work may be done in this whole field.

Now I want to point out to you for a second the necessity for such action. For the first time in the history of this country there has been created by Act of Congress certain co-ordinating bodies, made up partly of officials and partly of civilians, through which all of the activities of these organizations may be made to serve the very urgent and the very definite needs of the government in the work which it is undertaking.

All of you know that about a year ago there was created a Naval Consulting Board. Since that time there has been created

an even more powerful organization known as the Council of National Defense, which I will touch on briefly a little later. This body is composed of six of the members of the Cabinet with an advisory commission of seven civilians, representing the great activities of this country, in transportation, in finance, in industry, in labor, in medicine and in science and research, etc.

It should need only a word from me to put before your minds the thought that if the various civilian organizations of this country will so concentrate that they may have a single point of contact with governmental affairs, that through this body, this Council of National Defense, there may be provided the best possible plan for the accomplishment of the objects which you all have in mind in attending these meetings here in Washington.

Let me go on for a moment to the industrial phase of this whole subject of preparedness and of defense with which I have been asked to deal. I might give you a general talk as to the need for work of this kind, but as I conceive of it, you desire from me a brief and simple statement of facts and an outline of plans which we have in hand.

In the beginning I desire to remind you of the thought expressed in the Thursday afternoon session of this Congress, that wars, as now waged, involve every human and material resource of a belligerent nation; that every man, woman and child is affected; that every sinew of industry, of transportation and of finance is harnessed in the country's service, to the one end and for the common good.

During the past two and a half years of the European struggle, we have seen the precedents of a century shattered and thrown to the winds; we have seen whole nations thrown into the melting pot of the great foundry of modern war, and recast in new moulds, and as we have watched this process there must have come home to even the most casual among us the shock of some realization of the tremendous task ahead if we are to accomplish within the next five years those things which we now know to be necessary if the United States is to hold its present great place in the family of nations.

I take it that this audience is more concerned as to ways and means to the practical end than in any broad statement of principles, and I shall restrict my remarks in that line.

I believe that all of us realize the vital need for the future of a closer understanding and co-operation between the government and the economic life of this country. I have sometimes felt, and have so expressed myself here in Washington, that the governmental departments are isolated or insulated, if you please, from a sympathetic contact with the industrial forces of the nation.

England, perhaps of all the world powers, before the war, most nearly resembled us in internal conditions and in tradition, and yet England to-day after only thirty months of time, with six millions of her men in the armies and with some millions of former non-producers in her factories, is supplying manufactured products far in excess in volume of anything ever dreamed of before the war. It should give us pause in our talks of world trade that the increased efficiency in the dozen countries at war will shortly be centered on the peace-time commodities of domestic and foreign commerce. Just what we are going to do about it seems to be the main point in question, and in our consideration of these problems we find the industrial and the military so interwoven that we cannot handle the one without the other.

German commercial industrialism, minus Prussianism, would have conquered the world inside of ten years, without the loss of a life. (Applause.)

But war was the German ideal, while industry with peace is our great national goal, and we need never fear any other.

I have already spoken about the creation of the Naval Consulting Board. Most of you know how this Board was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy a year and a half ago. Fewer of you have known as to the Council of National Defense, its creation and its objects, and fewer yet know of the Research Council formed under the joint direction of the Engineering Foundation representing all of the engineering talent of this country and the National Academy of Science.

The National Academy of Science was created many years ago under governmental charter and is in a sense an official arm of the government.

The first two of these bodies exert a co-ordinating influence each in its respective field, and the Council of National Defense, possibly the most unique and powerful influence ever legalized

by an American Congress, has for its objects in the broader words of the Creating Act, "The creation of relations which will render possible in time of need the immediate concentration and utilization of the resources of the nation." It is to this body that has been turned over the 27,000 schedules collected in the industrial inventory of the country's manufacturing and producing resources, carried on during the past year by the great National technical societies under the guidance of the Committee on Industrial Preparedness of the Naval Consulting Board. It is through this co-ordinating channel that this patriotic constructive engineering work for a commercial—mark you—as well as a military defense will be put into the service of the nation.

This work of the Naval Consulting Board involved three steps of fundamental importance. First, to find out what the country might do in time of war, in the line of war materials and as to producing resources therefor. Second, to evolve a plan for the practical education of these resources through minimum annual educational orders, so that in time of emergency each plant might begin without delay the delivery, against government need, of the particular munition, part or thing, for which its tool equipment through careful peace-time analysis has been found to be best fitted, and for which it has been listed in the general scheme of National supply.

The third step, as you will remember, had to do with such an enrollment of skilled labor as would insure against its loss to industry, through enlistment in the fighting army.

As the Chairman says that I have a good many minutes yet, I am going to read to you a brief foreword, which will be published within the next thirty days as a preface for the first munition text book ever written in the world.

"Two years of experience on orders for foreign governments has taught our American manufacturers that the making of materials of modern warfare is a new art. It is an art with which we have had little or no previous experience and in which our workmen are unskilled.

"In England, a little over two years ago, there were not over three governmental arsenals. To-day, more than five thousand of England's leading industrial plants are being operated as Government factories for the production of war materials, and many other thousands of factories still under private control are concentrating their energies in the same direction."

The teaching of the munitions making art to these thousands of manufacturers and to millions of industrial workers, both men and women, has called for a work in industrial organization and education such as the world has never before seen. In France, in Germany, in Italy, in Japan, and even in Russia, this same education and organization of the industrial forces is going forth.

We have here in the United States vast resources in manufacturing and producing equipment, but they are unorganized and uneducated for the National service. We have in this country a producing power in excess of that possessed by any other two nations of the world.

Our observations of the European war have taught us that it is upon organized industries that we must base any and every plan of military defense, that in the event of trouble with any one of the several first-class powers, between 80 and 90 per cent. of our industrial activity would, of necessity, be centered upon the making of supplies for the Government.

We have learned, also, that from one to two years of time—and we have learned this through the bitter experience of the manufacturers who have been engaged during the past two years in the production of war materials in this country—we have learned that from one to two years of time, of conscientious effort, are needed to enable any large manufacturing establishment to change over from its usual peace-time commercial line to the quantity production of war materials for which it has no previous training.

Let me point out to you also the mistaken thought in the minds of many people, that because many of our manufacturers at the moment are producing materials for foreign governments, that these manufacturers are prepared at a moment's notice to step in as a support for our own military organization. Investigation carried on a short time ago by a War Department board brought out the startling fact that even those plants in this country which are now producing rifles, for instance, for foreign governments, could not within eighteen months to two years be expected to produce the Springfield rifle in such quantity as would make such production worth while. Delays of this kind in time of emergency cannot but result in closed plants, in the disruption of labor organizations built up over a period of years,

a loss of skilled men through enlistment for the fighting front, and in those same chaotic conditions which wrought near-disaster to several of the nations at the outbreak of the European struggle.

Let me bring this home to you for just one moment. I doubt if there are three people in this room representing manufacturing establishments, who have any conception in their minds at this moment as to what they or their business institutions would be called upon to do after a declaration of war. And yet it seems to me that when, in our common knowledge, this country has been skating for two years and a half on the thinnest kind of international diplomatic ice, with a possibility of a conflagration such as war much more imminent than the possibility of a fire in any manufacturing plant, that it would seem only business common sense to give some thought as to what we may be called upon to do for the morrow. Why not take at least such ordinary precaution as we take in fire insurance against this other kind of a catastrophe. (Applause.)

I wish to bring just one other practical thought before you. Take any of our big industries—I will mention the motor car industry, because I am thoroughly familiar with all of the details of its organization and mechanism, but it is merely a sample of all the other big industries in this country. There are 100 manufacturers of motor cars of what we may term the first magnitude. Investigation has shown to us that not more than 20 per cent. of these manufacturers would be engaged in the making of motor cars after the outbreak of a war, and I think I am correct in saying to you that out of the other eighty-five concerns, there are not more than three or four in which either officers or workmen have any conception whatever as to what these plants would be called upon to manufacture for the Government in case of an emergency.

I mentioned a moment ago a text-book of munition manufacture. We realize, of course, that in a campaign of education in the production of war materials, that one of the first necessities is a text-book dealing with the conversion of the tools of peace-time to the necessities of war-time, and a collection of data as to the special treatment and the handling of war material. One would think, possibly, that foreign governments, especially where great armaments have been the order of the

day for years, would have been prepared in this regard. So far as I know, not one of them, was so prepared, and hence much of the grief of American manufacturers who have taken foreign orders in this country. They have been tied up because of an utter lack of knowledge upon their part as to the methods and details of this specialized production.

During the past year, a collection of this vitally valuable data on foreign munitions work has been made through private effort, and the same agency is now at work in all of the arsenals and navy yards of the United States Government collecting this same class of information pertaining to the production of American war materials. This work has been done under the direction of Mr. Alfred, the editorial chief of "The American Machinist," and, I think that we all owe to Mr. Alfred and his corps of workers, a vote of thanks for this achievement. (Applause.)

Now, it may be that some of you will say that this is all a very fine plan, but that Congress is not apt to support it. I believe many of you here are possessed of the thought that it is necessary to develop public sentiment, in order that Congress may take such action as will permit the accomplishment of some of the practical things I have outlined to you. That is not the case. Congress has already done nearly everything that it is necessary for Congress to do. The things needed now are executive action and engineering and manufacturing initiative, just plain, every-day hard work, with no mystery about it.

I will be brief. I desire, however, to call to your attention three public documents. I refer to Public Document No. 242, an act making appropriation for the contingencies of the army; Public Document No. 85, an act dealing with the composition of the Regular Army, and a report published only a few days ago, which represents the very latest estimates of the War Department in determining just what is really necessary for the National Defense. This report is entitled, "The Government Manufacture of Arms, Munitions and Equipment," and it is Document No. 664, in the form of a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of the proceedings of the Board of which Col. Francis J. Kernan of the Twenty-Eighth Infantry was president.

Referring now to the bill dealing with the composition of the Regular Army, we find under section 120 that the President

is empowered in time of war or when war is imminent, in addition to the present authorized method of purchase or procurement, to place orders with any individual firm, association, corporation, etc., also, farther, in this same paragraph, that any refusal upon the part of such firm, private corporation, etc., to co-operate in this work, may be punished by imprisonment for three years and a fine of $50,000. (Applause.) Farther, in this same section, we find that the Secretary of War is empowered to make a complete list and analysis of all manufacturing plants capable of producing arms or ammunition, the preparation of a list of such plants, and the presentation of such data, as will enable these plants to be made effective for the public defense immediately upon the outbreak of war.

Under section 123 we find that the departments of the Government have been empowered in time of peace to have made up at Government expense and to supply to private manufacturers and to Government plants, the gauges, dies, jigs, tools and such appliances for the production of the particular parts or things for which these great plants are to be held responsible in the event of war.

And just for a moment, let me call attention to the facts just published in the report of the Col. Kernan Board: "At the beginning of the war in 1914, even Austria-Hungary, using only 75 per cent. of her available tonnage, could have landed in this country 72,000 men within 20 days. Germany, using only a half of her tonnage, could have landed in this country within 15 days 387,000 men. Japan, in a little longer time, under the same conditions, 95,746 men. And a second expedition could have been landed here by these powers in times varying from 30 days to 40 days thereafter." I won't take the time to read the details.

One other thing: You will find in this report tables giving not only the latest estimates of the War Department as to the army necessities in this country, but you will find given the times needed for the production under present conditions of the munitions to supply that army. With the present arsenal facilities, in rifles it would require eight years, and in machine guns an estimate is not even made. But on that point I might mention that six months after the beginning of the war, England was getting machine guns only at a rate that would have put her on an equality with her enemies at the end of thirty years. [Re-

ferring again to the table.] Cartridges, in twenty-three years; field guns, in nineteen and a half years, and field artillery, ammunition, in thirty-four years.

I might go on in this strain for a week, but I merely desire to bring home to you some conception of the size of the job before us. There is no mystery about it, as I have said. But we have a bigger task even than this on our hands. Within the next five years one hundred millions of people representing every political and religious creed and every nationality on the face of the earth must be so welded as to insure a unity of efficient action in any international emergency in which this country may become involved. Here lies the greatest need of all! (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN SHAW: I am sure you have been greatly interested in hearing Mr. Coffin, because he represents what is probably the most practical and urgent work for preparedness that is now going on in the country, a work that needs to be prosecuted with the intelligent co-operation of the country, rather than in the face of indifference and a failure to comprehend.

On account of committee meetings that will require the attention of Mr. Gardner at his place in the House, we will change the order of the program and we will call upon Mr. Gardner, the Hon. Augustus P. Gardner, of Massachusetts. (Loud applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, I see that you don't expect anything more to be said. You want to hear from Mr. Gardner at once. Mr. Gardner has an acute understanding of the need of preparation in this country to meet the responsibilities that the world expects it to meet, as you all know and understand.

It gives me great pleasure to present Mr. Gardner. (Applause.)

PITFALLS IN THE PATH OF PREPAREDNESS

Hon. Augustus P. Gardner, Representative in Congress from Massachusetts

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I am in favor of a league to enforce peace, but it must be a league composed of the forty-eight States of the Union, not of foreign nations. (Applause.) And it is going to be armed so strongly that it can enforce peace—that is, our peace, not Europe's peace or Asia's

peace. (Applause.) I am not in favor of a league to enforce peace which binds us to send men and money to mix in a European or Asiatic quarrel in which we have no concern. (Applause.) What is more, no nation's head can travel all over his country in 1916 demanding "incomparably the most adequate navy in the world" and then turn around in 1917 and tell every other nation that they must disarm. That is to say no President can preach that sort of doctrine unless he wants to make the world laugh. People in high places in this country have changed their minds once already on the preparedness movement (laughter and applause), and they are exceedingly likely to change again, if they haven't already changed. (Applause.) There is no use talking preparedness when we are turning around and saying to the world, "We have dreamed a new peace plan; the old plans have all gone by the board, and the new plan is going to require general disarmament." That sort of talk doesn't hitch with the proposition for "incomparably the most adequate navy in the world." (Laughter.)

The fact is, that we Americans have been sitting like a lot of fat dowagers in the front row of the orchestra, all covered with jewels. We have been scolding and lecturing and talking and philosophizing for the people down in the blood and dust of the arena who have been doing the fighting, and doing the work. Uncle Sam has talked so much and done so little, that I am afraid he isn't going to count for as much as he ought to count for when it comes to the time for peace. I for one, believe in letting the nations that are doing the fighting do a little of the talking too.

Instead of strengthening our flabby muscles we have been spending our time trying to invent a new patent for universal peace, every time the old patents were shown up as no good. We seem to think that European nations are staying awake at night wondering how they are going to get up an international scheme to protect us in the enjoyment of our prosperity. (Loud applause.)

Here we find a situation where European nations have scarcely any of the money, mightly little land, immense military power, while we have got most of the money, boundless land, and no military power at all. Yet we think that Europe is passing sleep-

less nights thinking about a league to defend us against them. (Laughter and applause.)

We even think that the Japanese are developing their navy with an idea of putting it under some international Admiral to preserve the "freedom of the seas." (Applause.) Let us be honest for a moment about that "freedom of the seas." To whom have the seas been otherwise than free in the peace time during the last hundred years? To the pirates alone; they are the only people who have been driven off the seas in the last hundred years. (Applause.)

And now comes along another plan of the dove for clipping the talons of the hawk—the League to Enforce Peace, with an International Court composed of a judge from Japan and a judge from Germany and a judge from China and a judge from Russia and a judge from Heaven knows where, to settle international disputes and an international army and navy to back up the decrees. That is the proposition. Vague and ill-considered as this proposal is which has been so deftly flung out it has nevertheless dampened the ardor of the people for the preparedness movement, because there is no sense in going ahead with a preparedness program if eternal peace is on the way.

The President says that the settlement of the European war cannot long be postponed—but the President may be wrong; he often is. (Laughter and applause.) He is certainly wrong about lasting peace, if the coming European peace is to be a peace without victory (Loud applause.) because throughout history peace without victory has meant nothing but a truce, while the combatants catch their breath.

The history of the world shows that peace doesn't come to the poultry yard until there is a cock-of-the-walk. (Applause and laughter.) While there are two rival cocks in the poultry yard, you only have peace so long as it takes them to get over the wounds from each others' spurs. You cannot have a lasting peace in Europe until the fundamental question at issues is settled. The irrepressible conflict is there. Either autocracy or democracy must go down in ruins, before we can have lasting peace. In the small compass of Europe, there can no longer be the two systems existing side by side; one or the other must go down, and God help us if we hold the scales of neutrality with

such nicety that we incline them toward autocracy's side. (Loud applause.)

The President is a great student of history. He is a bad analyzer of history or else he is a mischievous interpreter of history. There is no such thing as a lasting peace without victory. We had no lasting peace in this country until the North triumphed in the Civil War. For thirty years Americans were ready to fly at each others' throats, and lasting peace only came when victory forced peace on the loser. Yet the President believes that when victory is forced on the loser there can be no lasting peace. We never had lasting peace in this country until victory was forced on the loser, and to-day North and South alike are glad that we did not follow Horace Greeley's program in 1864. Some of you may have forgotten that Greeley, the editor of the greatest organ of public opinion in the North at that time, joined with the Copperheads and the Pacifists in declaring the war a failure and in demanding a truce with no settlement of the slavery question. Lincoln stoutly resisted Greeley and his timid cohorts. The war was fought to a conclusion and peace between the North and South has reigned ever since. Do you believe that we should have had fifty years of peace if there had been no victory and if slavery had not been destroyed?

Napoleon kept Europe ablaze with war for twenty-three years. Either England or Napoleon had to go down in ruins. France wasn't crushed, it was Napoleon that was crushed. The South wasn't crushed; it was slavery that was crushed. There is all the difference between victory over a nation and crushing a nation. The President has confused his terms. (Applause.)

In the middle of those long Napoleonic wars in Europe, there came in 1802 the sublimest "peace without victory" that mind of man ever has conceived. The combatants were tired of scratching each others' eyes out, they were tired of the wounds from each others' spurs, and they proclaimed a lasting peace between France and Great Britain in May of 1802. That lasting peace lasted thirteen months and nineteen days. (Applause.) And then the war broke out again in Europe, and it never ended until victory forced peace on the loser at Waterloo. Since that time there has been lasting peace between France and England for over one hundred years, and no hard feelings, either. (Loud applause.)

Now, suppose we look this proposition of the League to Enforce Peace right in the eye, take it and turn it around and examine it from all sides. It surely presents a beautiful picture on the surface. Here is the proposition: We are to have an International Court with an international army and an international navy to enforce its decrees. That sounds all right. But supposing it doesn't work. Supposing, as happened in 1914, that something happens which can't possibly happen. (Laughter.) Supposing some nation or some combination of nations refuses to obey the decree of the International Court. Supposing this combination gets belligerent on the subject and supposing the International Court is obliged to order out the International Army and Navy and calls on us as a part of the League to do our share in putting down the belligerents. How is it going to be if the International Court orders us to take a hand in one of the world's quarrels in which our people take but little interest and have no concern whatever.

Under our form of government Congress alone has the power to declare war. Have you so completely lost confidence in your own Congress that you propose to take away from us the power to declare war for the United States and lodge that power in the hands of a group of European and Asiatic lawyers? Yet that is precisely what we are undertaking to do if we join an International League to Enforce Peace such as President Wilson favors. And, my friends, it is a singular phenomena of human nature that it is always the same individuals who year after year grasp at each new patent "peace" plan regardless of its merits. The very people who are now arguing in favor of giving over the power to declare war for the United States to a Court of international lawyers, a year ago were protesting that the United States ought not to go to war until there had been a vote of the people. Those very same people to-day are lauding to the skies the patent which President Wilson has stolen from President Taft, that is to say, the scheme for an International League to Enforce Peace with the right to declare war lodged in the hands of a court of international lawyers. (Applause.)

Suppose that we had belonged to an International League to Enforce Peace in 1914, and suppose that the International Court had decided that Germany and Austria were in the wrong, that Servia was in the right, that Servia had made enough conces-

sions, and suppose that in spite of all that, Germany and Austria didn't agree. Suppose that the International Court had ordered out the International Army and Navy—do you think that we, as a matter of fact, when it came to carrying out our treaty, could have secured a majority in both Houses of Congress to vote half a million of our good men and a billion or so of our good money to send over seas to take part in that European quarrel? No matter what our treaty with the nations was, do you suppose that we, as a matter of fact, would have carried it out? (Cries of "Yes" and cries of "No.")

Well, I am in Congress, and I am glad the gentleman who shouted "Yes" has such a healthy opinion of us. (Laughter and applause.) I only wish our history in the past bore him out. Unfortunately it does not do so. We violated our treaty with China when we passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, necessary as that exclusion act undoubtedly was, and we violated many a treaty which we made with the Indians. The fact is that nations seldom keep treaties when the pace gets too hot.

I wonder whether we would be willing to submit the Monroe Doctrine to arbitration. I am not sure but we would; we are getting pretty wobbly. (Laughter.) After peace has been declared in Europe, suppose that Germany goes before the International Court and says: "Here, Mexico is cheating us out of a lot of money. The United States says that it will not collect the money for us, and furthermore it says that we must not send our troops to collect our money for ourselves. Is that right?" How is that International Court going to decide? Is it going to decide in favor of the Monroe Doctrine, or is it going to decide in favor of the various nations which have interests in Mexico? What are we going to do about it if the Court decides against us? Are we going to enforce the Doctrine? If so, we had better map the plan out, so that there will be no question about our enforcing it, before we agree to enter an International League to Enforce Peace. The President very cleverly sidesteps that issue. He tells us that we are to have a Monroe Doctrine of the World.

The Monroe Doctrine for this continent is dangerous enough, but God save us from a Monroe Doctrine of the World, which would force us, at the bidding of a group of international lawyers, to take every foreign quarrel upon our shoulders. Some-

times I doubt whether we would back up the Monroe Doctrine with force of arms. The Speaker of the House of Representatives last summer said that the American people would never arbitrate the Monroe Doctrine so long as the earth moved in its orbit. He said that it is the life-preserver of the western world. I hope that Speaker Clark is right.

Well, now it seems as if we might be getting into mighty deep water, if we mix up in this League to Enforce Peace, because the Monroe Doctrine is one of the very first dogmas which is going to be challenged.

I will tell you another of our doctrines which is going to be challenged. It may not interest some of you, but it interests me, for in Congress I represent a labor district. I represent, very largely, men who work daily with their two hands. It was labor men way back in the eighties who forced the adoption of the law excluding Chinese cheap labor from this country. Nowadays we also exclude Japanese labor, not by law, but by a sort of gentleman's agreement, known as the Root-Takahira agreement. The fact is that our workingmen have made up their minds that we must not have our standard of living undermined by cheap laborers.

In other words, we have said to Japan, the greatest fighting nation which Asia has ever produced, the proudest nation of the East, we have looked her straight in the eye and we have said, "Find some other place for yourself in the world; you are not good enough for us. We will have none of you here." I don't blame Japan for being angry, neither do I blame the people of California and the laboring men for desiring to keep the Japanese out.

But my friends, wait till you get your International Court, and see what happens when Japan comes before that International Court and speaks for herself and her vassal China. Listen while she contends that merely because we white men were the first to arrive in this wonderful country, there is no reason why we, in our selfishness should be permitted to exclude other men from its bounteous opportunities.

What is the decision of the International Court going to be? Is it going to be with us or is it going to be with Japan and China? Do you think that our workingmen will accept a decision

of the International Court which admits hordes of Asiatics to this country?

I told you a moment ago that our own skirts have been none too clean in the matter of keeping treaties. But I hope that in the future we shall never again put our hand to a treaty unless we mean to fulfill it to the last dot. (Applause.) Oh, that applause is all very well, but supposing that in the course of our travels we run afoul of a nation with notions that are not so altruistic as ours? Supposing we collide with a nation which has a tougher conscience and a bigger fleet? (Laughter.) What are we going to do then? Are we going to be able to stave that fleet off with a few salvos of applause, or with a few well directed shots from some Chautauqua platform? (Laughter.) Or do you thing that a million young men will leap to arms over night, if they can find any arms to leap to (Laughter.), or that the bathers at some seaside resort will swim out and swallow the enemy's submarines, or what do you think is going to happen? (Laughter and applause.)

My friends, those doctrines, the Monroe Doctrine and the Asiatic exclusion doctrine, are first-class doctrines, but you will never support them with a third-class navy. (Applause.)

I wonder what the result would have been if we had submitted to arbitration all the troubles about which we have hitherto gone to war. If you think it over, I believe that you will come to the conclusion that we should probably have lost the decision in nearly every case. We might still be a Dominion of Great Britain, Texas would probably be a part of Mexico to-day, and I do not believe that that would be beneficial to mankind. Slavery might still flourish within our borders and Spain would still be struggling with rebellious Cuba.

It may be that internationalism is the remedy for the whole thing. I don't believe it. It was not nationalism which brought about our greatest war, the Civil War. But possibly internationalism is ultimately destined to bring us lasting peace.

The trouble with that program is that internationalism is so far off, because the world is full of nations with different ideals and customs who speak different languages. It is all very well to talk about enthroning the brotherhood of man. That is a very noble aspiration. However, I shall not believe that the brotherhood of man is within the scope of practical statesmanship until

you can show me a Californian who is willing to have his daughter marry a Chinaman or a Mississippian who would consent to his sister's marriage with a negro.

So I guess I shall wait a while for an internation with an international flag. In the meanwhile, I have a sort of a feeling about that familiar old textile fabric over there which we call the Stars and Stripes. I don't want to see that bit of bunting supplanted by a sort of a medley of all the flags of the world, with a great, big, yellow streak down the center. (Laughter and applause.) That flag means something to me. I know what it stands for. It brings to my ears the drums of Concord and the fifes at Lexington, and I hear the thunder of Perry's cannon in the Battle of Lake Erie. When my eye lights on that banner, I see the stricken field at Gettysburg, and the sharp escarpment of Missionary Ridge, and I hear the deep bass of Dewey in Manila Bay and the rattle of the musketry at Santiago. I know what that flag means in peace as well as in war. I know how it stands for liberty and for the rights of man; for the public school, for popular government, and for the simple virtues of home. May the God of our fathers grant that it shall never go down in defeat. (Prolonged applause, and three cheers were given by those present.)

CHAIRMAN SHAW: Our next speaker is Mr. Frederick Winsor, the head master of the Concord Middlesex School, at Concord, Massachusetts, whose subject is "Educational Preparedness." I am sure you will all be very glad to hear from Mr. Winsor. (Applause.)

EDUCATIONAL PREPAREDNESS

Mr. Frederick Winsor, Head Master Middlesex School Concord, Mass.

Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen: I take it that the part to be played by the educational institutions of this country in the general movement for preparedness is chiefly an indirect one; our schools and colleges cannot assist to any great extent in the actual training of soldiers or officers. They have not the machinery necessary for doing it, and it would be stepping outside their province to acquire that machinery. The proper func-

tion of schools and colleges is so to prepare the youths of the country for citizenship that they will be ready and anxious to fulfil all the obligations which citizenship implies.

Now the most important obligation implied by citizenship in a democracy is service; service of the country in time of peace by an active participation in the political life of community, state, and nation; service in time of war either as part of the armed forces or as part of the still larger organization of agriculture and industry which supports the armed forces. Educational preparedness, then, means education for service.

Service, to be successful, must be zealous, intelligent, and skilful. These three essentials should be kept steadily in view by the teachers of our young men and women in their efforts to prepare their pupils for the supreme test of service, that is for war, and it should never be forgotten that while it is important to drill young men in the handling of arms and in the movement of bodies of troops, the young women in the manipulation of bandages and in the principles of first aid, it is still more important to teach them the necessity for such training, that is, the frightful risk and waste of unpreparedness; and it is most important of all to inspire them with such principles of unselfish patriotism that they cannot stand idle when their country needs them. For if our citizens have this sort of patriotism and are also shown the plain necessities of the situation—that is, if they are inspired with zeal and informed with intelligence—they will themselves insist on acquiring the skill. If the youth of these United States are taught to love their country more than their lives, and are made familiar with her military needs as the swift movements of modern history and modern science develop those needs, can we doubt that they will insist on that universal training which will enable every man and every woman in the time of the country's danger to do efficiently his or her part in its defense?

Before we pursue further the inquiry as to the details of education's part in this movement, I should like to have you examine for a moment the material which at the present day you are asking your schools to turn into patriotic citizens. I believe few people realize the nature of the task. Fifty years ago, for example, the public school children of the city of Boston were practically solidly English-speaking children of English-speaking

parents. Even in New York the preponderance of such children in the schools was overwhelming. Today in many of our larger cities there are schools where the children of English-speaking parents are the exception, where the study of English has its place in the curriculum not as literature, not with the aim of perfecting the pupil's style of composition, but in order to teach them to understand the language.

These children are unfamiliar not only with the language of the United States, but with its traditions as well. Fifty years ago we had just finished a great war. The children of the land, whether in the North or in the South, could not fail to learn one great lesson of that war, the obligation to service that rests on each citizen. On either side the men who had fought were honored, the men who had shirked were despised. Since then we have successfully concluded another war, but no such lessons could be learned from it. After the war with Spain the air was full, not so much of honor for our citizen soldiers, as of criticism of the system which first half-trained them and then killed them by hundreds in unsanitary mobilization camps. The effect on the young people especially, as well as on their elders, was that honor to the volunteer for his high ideals of citizenship was obscured by the storm of protest against the incompetence of a military organization which resulted in such inefficiency and waste. To-day the idea of military training in the militia has become still further discredited, first by the use of the militia as an apparent ally of capital in labor disputes, and second, by the recent abortive wars with Mexico. Since the militia has so far afforded the only opportunity for military training open to the ordinary citizen, discrediting militia service has had the effect on the children of the country of discrediting all military service by citizens.

The influence of the home on large numbers of our school children also tends to weaken their sense of obligation, to deprive them of any realization of the meaning of patriotism. The parents of these hordes of children who have to be taught the English language can be no influence for good in this respect. They can be roughly divided into two groups: Those who left their former allegiance because they hated the government, and who have never in their lives felt the thrill of patriotism, and those who, in spite of their love of their fatherland were driven

to emmigrate by economic pressure, and who bring us the divided allegiance of the hyphenated American. Such parents are little likely to inspire their children with that love of country which leads men to lay down their lives gladly in its defense. But there are many American-born parents who are little better. We who are trying to teach the youth of the country patriotism daily find it harder to combat the growing tendency of the times to look upon the Government as something to be exploited rather than supported; the tendency of men to ask not, "What can I do for my country?" but, "What can my country do for me?" Socialism, Labor, and Capital, are all alike to blame, and so are Privilege and Pork.

The very conditions of modern life, too, have a strong tendency to weaken in every individual the sense of obligation to his neighbors and therefore to his country. A very large proportion of our young people are growing up in cities, where the individual citizen's share in the city government and his responsibility for its conduct are just about as direct as are those of a shareholder in a corporation. Like the shareholder, his chief interest is in the dividends on what the corporation does for him. If things go wrong the citizen blames, not himself and his neighbors, but a vague, far-off thing that he calls the Government. Moreover, the children, while they are growing up and absorbing these views of their elders are not themselves learning lessons of personal service. Life in a tenement or a flat-house is different from life in the country, and reacts differently on the child. On the farm each member of the family must contribute his share of personal labor for the general welfare. The boys feed the stock and do the chores, and there becomes inbred into the very fibre of their being the realization that when men are banded together for any purpose each one must do his share of work. But in the flat-house or the tenement common activities are unknown. There are no chores to be done. To be sure each member of a family contributes his share of the general income from the moment he becomes a wage-earner, but it is a money contribution. It is like paying taxes, not like giving service, and the obligation, speaking generally, ends with the payment. The only interest of the individual after the money is paid is to see that he gets his money's worth.

We see then, that a large proportion of the pupils in our

schools are growing up under influences that tend to make them not only uninterested in our national Government, but ignorant of the very notion of personal obligation to public service. What shall the schools do to meet this discouraging situation?

First of all, the schools should teach American History, honestly and thoroughly, not once only, but again and again. In the primary schools the teaching should be in the form of biography, stories of the lives of the nation's great servants in peace and in war. Our history furnishes an almost inexhaustible store of examples of men who have unselfishly devoted to their country their ability, their time, and their fortunes, and sometimes their lives as well. It is impossible in this teaching to lay too much stress on the nobility of such unselfish devotion, and every effort made to enable the little children to catch the inspiration of such self-sacrifice will be repaid a thousand fold, for the imagination of a little child is very sensitive, and his memory very retentive. Fill his imagination with pictures of noble citizenship, and his memory will recall those pictures throughout his life. It will not be necessary to preach to him about ideals; the ideals will have sprung into being already in his soul.

In the grammar schools a more formal study of our history will naturally find a place. Let me make a plea for its honesty, especially in regard to our military prowess as a nation. We all know the sort of stories fed out to us in our childhood, and how we have since been slowly and laboriously ridding ourselves of the notion that the American soldier can go out and give his enemy every advantage of training, equipment, and position and then wipe him off the face of the earth. I am probably not the only member of this gathering who had subconsciously clung to these ideas up to the time that the truth was flung into our faces by General Leonard Wood. When he began to go up and down the land with his fearless array of facts most of us woke up with a jar from the slumber of security into which we had been hypnotized by the spread-eagle histories of the last generation. The worst of it is that such lies are not in the least necessary in order to instill patriotism into childish minds, and all that they really teach is a false patriotism. Patriotism isn't brag and bluster; it is love. The true history of our country has in it plenty of admirable things, plenty of inspiring examples, plenty of acts of devotion to our country that make us all proud of it

and of the men who made it and defended it. Let us teach our children these things. They are concerned chiefly with peaceful living, and they make up in their total sum the ideals for which the democracies of the world are striving. And, gentlemen, they are ideals worth fighting for. More, I venture to predict that if we are to preserve them we shall have to fight for them. Children of the grammar school age are not too young to face the fact that there are forces for evil in the world which look with hatred on the ideals for which this country stands, and that loyalty to those ideals may mean standing armed in the face of the danger of death to protect them against assault. Education should prepare them gladly so to stand.

But, also let us not leave them in ignorance of the power of the forces of evil. If they are not too young to be inspired to risk their all for their ideals neither are they too young to learn how to prepare against the assault. They should learn as children whatever children can comprehend of the real strength of a modern power, armed and prepared for aggression, and they should be made to understand clearly how helpless against a nation so armed is one equipped merely with enthusiasm and ideals. Every child of twelve in this country ought to have been taught in school enough of the truth about warfare to recognize the sheer idiocy of such babble as the promise of an army of a million men rising to arms over night.

On the foundation of the work done in the grade schools should be built the complete course in history in the high schools. The study of human history should be taken up from a similar point of view, stressing the striving for ideals, and the lives of the great servants of mankind. It has recently become the fashion to decry the study of the battles and campaigns of history on the ground that they are not fundamental to the world's progress. We are told to search for the economic causes of the world's development and to pass lightly over the world's wars. But right has not always triumphed in history. Again and again civilization has been retarded by the military strength of wrong. Historians have no business to let us shut our eyes to that self-evident fact. There are lessons to be learned for us to-day from our own military history and from that of other nations, and these lessons our people should learn in the course of their public school education.

Such a course in history as I have outlined should teach our young people two things—the glory of the service of their country, and an intelligent understanding of the meaning and the need of service. There should be added a thorough course in civil government and the duties of citizenship. Then, in theory, at least, the pupils will leave our schools prepared to play their parts.

Our schools, however, should go further than this. It is a commonplace of educational science that no one really learns anything unless theory is accompanied by practice. It will not answer merely that children shall be taught the rules of the game; they should have the chance to play it. Theorists are the curse of humanity; we want to fill our children with ideals which are practical, and which they know are practical because they have put them into practice. This is the educational principle, which lies behind the "school state" idea, the "school town-meeting," and behind self-government associations of all kinds. They drive home citizenship by practice.

Just so the sense of obligation to military training and service should be driven home by practice. Please notice that in advocating military training in our schools and colleges I am not contending for it from the point of view of the soldier. The military value of drilling school boys and collegians two or three times a week is at least debatable. Personally I believe that a week at a training camp under active army officers probably teaches boys more about soldiering than two or three years of school boy drill under some militia officer or retired regular. But I stand squarely on the proposition that a rational, graded course in military instruction should be introduced into the last two years of the grade-school and the four years of high school course partly for its intrinsic value as a preparedness movement, but much more for the sake of the attitude of mind which should be the result.

The two years of the grade-school course should be devoted chiefly to the kind of instruction now carried on by the Boy Scouts. There should be a comprehensive course, including indoor instruction in:

(1) Personal Hygiene.
(2) First Aid.
(3) Setting-up Drill.

(4) Wall Scaling.
(5) Knot Making.
(6) Splicing.
(7) Signaling—the Morse and Continental Codes.

and outdoor instruction in:

(1) Tracking.
(2) Scouting.
(3) Fire Building.
(4) Cooking.
(5) Camp Sanitation.
(6) Camping.
(7) Map Reading and Making.
(8) Outposts.
(9) Patroling.
(10) Signaling and building of signal towers.

Also there should be drill in marching—the school of the soldier, squad and company, and drill in military courtesy and military discipline, all to be done without arms, but with uniforms. These boys are not yet big and strong enough to handle rifles, but wearing the uniform appeals to their pride and their soldierly instincts, and it gives them the sense of being one of many like units participating in one great movement. That feeling is the basic sense of true civic loyalty, of true citizenship.

In the high school the military drill should be continued, but with arms, and should be carried on to include the rudiments at least of most of the theory studied at the government military training camps. There should be some military value in all this work especially if emphasis is steadily placed on its true nature as a preparatory, not a final, training. It would be fatal to give boys the notion that such drill makes them even citizen-soldiers, but it ought to be a real inspiration to them to know that it is preparing them for further instruction.

Therefore, this school-boy drill can and should be made an adjunct to summer military camps for boys of fifteen or sixteen and older. There is the real opportunity for putting theory into practice, there is the real chance for a boy to serve his country, and in so doing to subordinate himself perhaps for the first time in his life. We want our boys to love their country; love is built on self-sacrifice, which is at once the proof and the food of love. No one really loves a thing until he has worked for

it; a man does not come to love his country till he has served it, any more than a man can really love God till he serves Him.

If there is any possible constitutional means of making at least one month's service at a military training camp a requirement for a diploma from every high school in the country I advocate its being done. I advocate it not merely as education in preparedness, but as education in and of itself of the best kind, a kind moreover, that most of our boys never get at all. Large numbers of the youth of this country have never had any experience worth mentioning with real discipline. The present day theories of kindergarten and Montessori schools, of elective and vocational training all founded on the idea that the pupil can be expected to work solely when he is interested and all ignoring the value of duty as a motive force, make discipline from study almost unknown. Our boys have no respect for authority and no notion of obedience except where obedience is obviously to their advantage. Promptness and punctuality are virtues unknown to them, and they stand excused in their own eyes for any sort of failure or blunder provided they "did not mean to do it." The first and most vital need of such boys is DISCIPLINE and until they get it they are a drag on the community and they are unfit to be citizens of a republic founded on the ideal of respect for law and obedience to the will of the majority.

It is possible that some of you may think that I over-estimate the importance of obedience as a virtue. You will tell me that I belong to the ruling class, for a school-master certainly comes near to being an absolute monarch. Some of you, too, fear military training because it sounds so much like militarism. Will Irwin, in an excellent article in this very last issue of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "The New Aristocracy," dwells at some length on the danger to democracy of universal military training. To these critics I would answer, look at France. Within ten years I have made a stay of a year and a half in that country, and I did not observe any indication of subservience to a ruling class. Moreover, I did not observe any tendency to militarism.

No, my friends, I observed in France none of the evil effects of a thorough military training which are so often imputed to it. On the contrary, I observed a nation where independence in politics is carried so far that there are eight or ten groups in the

chamber of deputies; where independence of thought is so keen in Science and in Art that we lag far behind; where the sense of civic duty is infinitely more wide spread than here in America; where recognition of a man's worth as a man, disregarding accidents of birth or wealth, is much more common than here among us; where kindly courtesy is almost universal. More: to-day we see in France a national spirit which makes the whole world stand with uncovered head.

Is this splendid example of national excellence the result of military training? Of course it isn't, but it has gone hand in hand with a system of military training more prolonged than any that is even contemplated here. The secret of that national excellence is ideals persistently instilled into the people by Education. The education in national and civic ideals that I have been advocating before you is not new and untried, it is not the creature of my ingenuity; it has been carefully worked out and followed out across the sea for a score of years, and it has resulted in the most inspiring people on the earth to-day—the people of France.

CHAIRMAN SHAW: I am sure we all feel deeply indebted to Mr. Winsor for the very admirable paper that he has presented on education for preparedness.

Let me announce that the next session, the afternoon session, is at the D. A. R. Hall, at 2:30 sharp, and that we have one more presentation, which will be brief, before the adjournment of this meeting. Mr. J. Bernard Walker, my distinguished colleague, the Editor of the Scientific American, who is Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Navy, and who is a great authority, is about to present his report, which he will do briefly.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, our forefathers lived in the belief that because we have three thousand miles of water between us and Europe and five thousand miles of water between us and Asia, we are pretty well separated from the rest of the world. It was so in their day; it is not so to-day.

The oceans on either side of us bring us, in the naval sense, closer to the other nations of the world than if we were in touch with them by land. Why? Because of the secrecy of the sea. By land, if an army comes to you, you know of it; by sea, if it comes,

it comes unheralded, and the enemy is at your gates without warning.

There is one nation engaged in war to-day that could put on three of its ships an army as big as your mobile army, 30,000 men, and in seven days' time from the day on which those 30,000 men were loaded on the Bismarck, the Vaterland, and the Imperator, those 30,000 men could be at your gates fully equipped with everything necessary for active war.

With that preamble, let me proceed to read the report of your Committee on the Navy.

[NOTE: The report of the Committee of the Navy appears as Appendix C of the Proceedings of the Congress of Constructive Patriotism.]

CHAIRMAN SHAW: I am sure we are all very grateful to Mr. Walker for this very excellent report, which will be filed in the usual course.

ROBT. S. GREENE: I move that the report be accepted and adopted.

CHAIRMAN SHAW: You have heard the motion, that the report be accepted and adopted.

The motion was duly seconded.

ROBERT S. HOLT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the one clause as to munitions. Many people have in mind the possibility of supplies for the army or navy coming from abroad. It seems to me that the circumstances are such that if we cannot meet the needs we should not preclude the government from obtaining munitions elsewhere.

CHAIRMAN SHAW: The report was very careful to cover that point, and to say that, as a general thing, we should make them here. That was protected fully in the report.

All those in favor of the motion will signify by saying "Aye." Contrary "No." The report is adopted.

A MEMBER: Now, Mr. Chairman, will you kindly repeat the announcement of the meeting of the men of the Rifle Clubs?

CHAIRMAN SHAW: Those delegates who represent the various Rifle Clubs will please meet here after the adjournment of this session.

This session will now adjourn, and the regular afternoon session is at D. A. R. Hall, at 2:30 this afternoon.

SEVENTH SESSION

Saturday Afternoon, January 27, 1917
D. A. R. Memorial Hall

PATRIOTISM THROUGH EDUCATION

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Albion W. Small, Dean of the University of Chicago, who introduced the presiding officer, E. W. Nichols of Lexington, Va.

DR. ALBION W. SMALL: Ladies and Gentlemen: It is probably for the purpose of presenting to you a striking exhibit of American unpreparedness that the Committee have chosen an utterly unknown person to present to you a gentleman whose name and whose services to the country are known from one end of the country to the other. Mr. Menken, however, has diplomatically conveyed to me the information that my popularity with the National Security League will be in precisely inverse ratio to the length of my introductory remarks. (Laughter.)

Although this compels me to control almost uncontrollable impulses to address you on a choice selection of subjects, some relevant and some irrelevant to the objects of the occasion, I am entering for the ranks of one hundred per cent. patriotic by handing the gavel without comment to the Chairman of this session, Gen. E. W. Nichols, superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va. (Applause.)

GEN. E. W. NICHOLS: Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been greatly impressed with the meetings of this Congress that I have been privileged to attend, especially as I apprehend that this body of gentlemen and ladies are descendants of those who, hundreds of years ago, hewed their way through primeval forests and made possible the civilization which we to-day enjoy. And

I apprehend, too, that here, in large measure, are gathered the descendants of the Cavaliers of the South and of the Puritans of the North, men and women who by heredity know what patriotism means—men and women imbued by a long series of association and by heredity with the love of country which constitutes, in its real sense, a sentiment of patriotism which this Congress is designed to foster.

Patriotism, my friends is an intangible product of the heart and of the mind, a love of country, of its rills and its hills and its mountain-sides, but better, a knowledge of and appreciation of the struggles of those of our ancestors, running back through the hundreds of years, who made these hills and these rills and these mountain-sides our common country.

Patriotism is a product into which many factors enter and it takes time to produce it. We sing, "My Country, 'tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty, Of Thee we Sing," and I wonder, I frequently wonder, if outside of the descendants of the original Thirteen Colonies, scattered, and well scattered over our broad land, there is that intensity of patriotism which is shown in the older countries. I doubt it.

Scott, one of the distinguished English poets, uses this expression:

> "Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> 'This is my own, my native land?'"

Macaulay, another English writer, presents the same idea in a little different, but not less forceful language:

> "And how can man die better
> Than facing fearful odds,
> For the ashes of his fathers,
> And the temples of his gods?"

These are quotations from the poets of an older civilization. Is this sentiment, expressed by either of these authors, or by both, possible in its greater intensity in our land? I doubt it.

Patriotism is a relative term. The most intense form of it is known to those of us whose parents and whose forebears were among the earlier pioneers. A knowledge of what they wrought, of what they did, of the struggles they endured, of the hardships they encountered, of the battles they fought, comes down to us with our very blood, as a part of our being.

Here are assembled in large measure, if I apprehend it right, a body of patriotic, intensely patriotic citizens of our common country, brought together and actuated by a common impulse, and that is to develop and foster in our newer population that feeling of love of country which you and I enjoy.

Our topic this afternoon is "Patriotism Through Education." That is a topic considered critically and very carefully by thoughtful men. How can we educate our people into patriotism and into concepts of their obligations to themselves and to the country whose benefits they enjoy?

Permit me a suggestion: It takes time, but it takes a shorter time, I think, to carry out the aims and objects of developing patriotism through education along the line that I wish to suggest. For forty years I have devoted my life to the training of young men along military lines. As a member of the Advisory Committee of College Presidents, it has been my privilege to aid and foster, as best I might, the idea of the development of the Plattsburg Camp. It has been my privilege to be associated with that great, good and able man, one of the most practical patriots of this country, Leonard Wood. (Loud applause.)

And so, with all my experience and all my training, I say, and I think I say advisedly, the best educational process for the young men of our day and generation, along the line of a better citizenship, along the line of an intensive patriotism, is compulsory military service. (Loud applause.) I advocate that; I advocate it as an educator. Think of the benefits to accrue! Take a young man just passing through college, or perhaps just passing through the poor man's college—the high school. He is at a period of life of least economic value, of practically no economic value. He knows nothing adequately and no one thinks he does except himself. (Laughter.)

Take a young man of that kind, sent in to the colors for a year of intensive training. His education continues with no expense to him or to his people, he learns these fundamental, basic problems and principles of right living; he learns to do promptly, and faithfully, life's duties. And, my friends, if I apprehend life rightly, a man who has that one principle instilled in him in the formative period of life has a basis of success along any line of civic, along any line of human endeavor. Without it, his success is conjectural along any line at best.

Again, he learns from recognition of constituted authority. He learns to do what he is told to do, and do it in a hurry. He learns to obey, that he may later learn to command. He learns the principle of self-control and he learns the fundamental, basic principle of duty. The question of what he wants to do is secondary and the question of what he ought to do is primary. The democracy of the life is an invaluable asset to any young man in our democratic country. He touches elbows with others of his kind, without any adventitious circumstances of birth or connection. The place he takes is the place he makes. It is a man-developing process; it is a process that returns the young man, after a year of intensive training, back to his civil vocation a better economc factor and a better citizen. (Applause.) It solves, incidentally, this question of preparedness, in which you and I are so much interested.

But my interest primarily lies as an educator of youth in this compulsory military service, and I use the term, for I do not care to take two bites at the same cherry. Compulsory military training is to my mind a misnomer. That is not what I want. What I want may not come in my day and generation, but I do believe, and believe from the bottom of my heart, that as a patriotic citizen, as one who loves my country, as one whose ancestors, one one side from the South and on the other side from the North, were among the early settlers of this, our native land, I want to see our youth fitted along the lines that I indicate for better citizenship, for truer appreciation of their country, of what their country means to them, and of their obligations to it.

It fits them better for the discharge of the civic vocations to which they will be called, and in time of need you have so prepared them that at their country's call they will flock to the colors as trained soldiers to serve in that capacity as an avocation. (Applause.)

I now take pleasure in introducing to you Mr. Frederick L. Huidekoper, Author of "The Military Unpreparedness of the United States," a gentleman who through eleven or twelve years has devoted his entire time and talent the better to bring to you and me individually and to our people a realization of the distressing condition in which we now are and which would develop in the event of any aggressive warfare from either the East or

the West of this absolutely unprotected country. I take pleasure in introducing Mr. Huidekoper, the author of "The Military Unpreparedness of the United States" and the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Army. (Applause.)

ADDRESS

Mr. Frederic L. Huidekoper, Author of "The Military Unpreparedness of the United States"

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Many of you doubtless heard this morning the speech by the Hon. Augustus P. Gardner—one of those inimitable speeches which Mr. Gardner alone can make. In his speech he asked a question which was answered by a man in the audience. Whereupon Mr. Gardner remarked, "I am glad that you have so sound an opinion of Congress." I feel sure that if Mr. Gardner, like any other honest and far-seeing Senator or Representative, were pressed further on that subject, his reply would be very much like that of the negro who was charged with stealing and who, when asked by the judge "Guilty or not guilty?", answered, "Well, judge, dat's a very peculiar question to ask de person what stole de hog." (Laughter.)

There is a marked analogy between that darkey and his booty on one hand, and Congress and its prey on the other, this prey being better known as "pork," the barrel of which is now—and under the cloak of military preparedness—open at both ends

I have been asked to speak to you on the last effort of Congress to improve and strengthen the land forces of the United States. This was embodied in a measure approved by the President on June 3, 1916, the title of which is "An Act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes." We shall see presently that there are a good many "other purposes" in this law.

It required more than a year and a half of the present European war to awaken many Americans to a realization of what was needed in this country in the matter of national defense and to arouse them to an understanding that something must be done immediately on this score. Thank God that this awakening has come at last, because, prior to that time, most of us were

entirely too engrossed in our own affairs and mighty little concerned with the welfare of our country.

As you well know, the Senators and Representatives in Congress are, with few exceptions, but the mirrors of public opinion. Every one of you must clearly bear in mnd that no nation has ever yet had a great army or a great navy unless the people wanted them. When we Americans as a nation—I do not mean Americans in isolated spots, for such is the condition of those in this country who are to-day working heart and soul for proper national defense—really want the sort of army and navy that we ought to have if the United States is to play the part of a great Power, and when we speak in no uncertain terms, then we shall get them. Until we do speak in this fashion, we need expect nothing more than the half-hearted, cavalier treatment which, as a nation, we have received in the past at the hands of Congress when the question of adequate protection was concerned.

Remember that there is a great deal of truth contained in those lines of Shakespeare's play, Julius Caesar:

> "The fault, dear Brutus,
> Lies not with our stars, but with ourselves,
> That we are underlings."

If we Americans have not secured the passage of the measures necessary to insure proper protection to the nation, let us put the blame where it belongs, on you and on me and on everyone else who has sat supinely still and done nothing. (Applause.)

Many of us flatter ourselves that we have done something in this vital matter. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating," and how much have we accomplished in this direction will be disclosed in how much Congress has done in response to our demands. After an immense amount of pressure, extraordinary discussion and "hot air"—as the phrase runs—*ad lib* and indeed *ad nauseam,* Congress passed a measure dealing with the land forces and commonly known as "The National Defense Act." That legislation was approved by the President on June 3, 1916, and thus became a law.

It is manifest from this enactment that Congress was animated by a greater degree of patriotism than has heretofore been the case in respect to military legislation. Our own history affords

abundant examples of the fact that national security has rarely received proper recognition on Capitol Hill. This new condition, however, presages better and more scentific military legislation in the future, based upon sound principles and upon the recommendations of the General Staff and of experts who are qualified to judge of military needs.

Under the National Defense Act the Regular Army has been largely increased, but this increase is to be made gradually in five annual increments. That is the way that Congress habitually does things when the Army is concerned. It creates a beautiful image which appears quite remarkable when viewed from a distance, but, when one draws closer and begins to analyze it, one quickly discovers that this enticing image is nothing but a mirage which melts away into thin air. Five annual increments! Congress was not courageous to do for our country, in one fell swoop, what ought to have been done. It had to resort to the installment plan of five annual increments, and thus afford an opportunity to the pacifists—personally, I think that they ought to be called "pussy-fists" (laughter)—just as soon as the interest in national defense lags or the European war ends, to put a sudden stop to the whole scheme.

Under the previous laws the strength of the Regular Army was authorized at 5,029 officers and 81,932 enlisted men on a peace footing, with a maximum strength of 5,029 officers and 128,653 on a war footing. Under the National Defense Act the Regular Army is to consist of 11,327 officers and 208,338 enlisted men on a peace footing, and of 11,942 officers and 287,846 enlisted men at war strength. At first blush, these numbers appear very encouraging, but one must not be deluded. The 208,338 men who are to constitute the peace strength will not be attained unless the entire five annual increments are secured and of these only 163,161 will be fighting troops. Even when the maximum war strength of 287,846 is reached on July 1, 1920, the Regular Army will consist of 226,649 fighting men only—less than a quarter of a million to garrison our overseas possessions like the Philippines, Hawaii and the Panama Canal Zone, to man the fortifications which guard our coasts, and to protect us against possible invasion.

Most of you know that the losses in the present European war have far exceeded those in any other war in history, but how

many of you realize that certain British regiments have suffered so enormously—as for example, the Black Watch, the Cameron Highlanders and others—that as many as 17,000 men have had to be recruited since the war began in order to keep one particular regiment up to proper fighting strength. To be sure, there is a Regular Army Reserve destined to act as the reservoir from which trained soldiers can be drawn to maintain the forces at the front at full strength, but the existing law is so defective that it will be imposible to accumulate a reserve sufficiently large for this all-important purpose. In time of peace Congress has never been over-concerned with the Regular Army nor has it given it the strength and organization which would enable it to perform its proper role in time of war. Yet this is the force which is expected to constitute our first line of defense to-day as it has been in the past. We Americans would do well to take to heart the truth contained in those lines of Kipling about the British regular:

"It's Tommy this and Tommy that,
And Tommy 'ow's your soul;
But it's thin red line of 'eroes
When the drums begin to roll."

We all know how gallantly the first British Expeditionary Force fought in the summer of 1914 only to be annihilated because it was not sufficiently strong to withstand the vastly superior forces of the German armies in their mighty onslaught against Paris. Yet with this object-lesson staring us in the face, Congress persists in expecting our Regular Army to do the impossible, in spite of the fact that it has been given neither the strength or means to do it with. And when this paltry force of less than 250,000 trained troops has been destroyed, what then? Under those circumstances, we are to depend, as we have so often done in the past, upon half-baked, partially trained men and entrust our national destinies, perhaps our very national existence, to them, hoping that, by some stroke of good luck, sufficient time may be gained to give them enough training so that they can stand against the enemy.

I cannot impress too strongly upon you that war is the most serious and difficult of human undertakings. What does the sensible individual do when he finds himself attacked by a

serious malady, so serious as to require an operation? Does he entrust his case to a clumsy butcher? No, he sends for the best doctor, the best surgeon whom he can obtain. The best defense a nation can get on land is, obviously, a force of men trained for that specific purpose and numerous enough to grapple with any emergency that may threaten the safety of its national life. That is a fact that apparently Congress has not fully grasped even after a century and a quarter of national existence. In proof of this assertion I have only to point out that, under this last military legislation, the bulk of our land defense is to consist of militia which has not had, and cannot possibly get, sufficient training to make it a dependable force when pitted against Regular troops. Congress seems to be oblivious to the injustice of such a course nor does it heed that ringing indictment, born of the bitter experience of war, which was uttered by General Richard Henry Lee ("Light Horse Harry") of Revolutionary fame: *"A Government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field uninformed and untaught, where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and discipline for battle."*

There are, of course, certain notable merits and innovations in the National Defense Act, the most conspicuous being the expansive organization provided for the Regular Army. It is very important that all of you should know about this feature, especially because it is the scheme whereby every great army is enlarged in an emergency. Never before in our history has our Army been given such an organization and, as a result, instead of the Army's being expanded at once to its maximum strength when hostilities were imminent or had actually broken out, the President, the Secretary of War and all the military authorities had no alternative but to sit supinely and twirl their thumbs or cool their heels until Congress, by means of ill-digested legislation enacted at the eleventh hour, tried to create an army, often after war had actually begun.

Can you transform a green man into a physician, a lawyer or a competent business man in a few hours days or even weeks? The same reasoning is applicable to the creation of an efficient army in spite of the fact that Congress and many Americans not only of former but of this present generation, think that all that is necessary to transform any American into a first-class

soldier is to put a uniform on his back and a rifle in his hands. Our national conceit in this respect is nothing short of colossal, but it arises from several causes. Remember that the United States has never yet been pitted against the military strength of a first-class Power. We as a nation have no conception of what is meant by the application of well organized and thoroughly prepared military force. Our people have not yet grasped what modern war entails, and how imperative it is in this day to meet force by force equally as well trained.

Under the expansive organization now provided, the President can increase the Regular Army to the maximum authorized strength "in the event of actual or threatened war or similar emergency in which the public safety demands it," irrespective of whether Congress be in session or not. Under such conditions the very minutes are priceless, and this provision is therefore admirable.

European armies are expanded from a reduced or peace footing to a maximum of war strength by filling up the ranks with reservists who have previously been trained in, and done their service with, the active army. In consequence, their armies are increased by men who are as good soldiers as those already in them, so that the force is merely enlarged without being in any wise weakened.

Down to 1912 our Regular Army never possessed any reserve of trained soldiers. As a result, green men had to be poured in to fill up the ranks to their maximum. Any school-boy knows that untrained material injected into a team necessarily weakens its strength and efficiency. Congress, on the other hand, has consistently, habitually—indeed one might say, chronically—utilized raw, untrained men in enlarging the Regular Army on the outbreak of war. By the Act of August 24, 1912, a Regular Army Reserve was created, but so faulty were the provisions of this law that to-day this reserve—which, mind you, is the only one we possess composed of properly trained soldiers—numbers only about six thousand men. The National Defense Act will undoubtedly augment this number considerably, but even under its provisions the Regular Army Reserve will not, and cannot, reach the numbers which it ought to possess if it is to serve as the reservoir from which are to be drawn the trained soldiers necessary to raise the Regular Army to its full war strength.

In this last military legislation Congress has made several excellent innovations. It has created for the first time an Officers' Reserve Corps, a body destined to furnish the officers for the additional forces needed in time of war. It has established a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, composed of units classified into two divisions, senior and junior, which are to be organized at educational institutions and which are to afford the necessary training for candidates for the Officers' Reserve Corps. Training camps, modeled upon the lines of the Plattsburg camps of 1915 and 1916, are also inaugurated, an Enlisted Reserve Corps has been created as a reservoir to supply the skilled men required by an army, such as railway operatives, telegraphers, bridge builders, chauffeurs, nurses and hospital attendants. Congress has at last realized that "You cannot get something for nothing," and has therefore granted nominal pay to the men in the Regular Army Reserve. Furthermore, it has taken measures so that the employees of all departments of the Government may be utilized in matters pertaining to the various reserves. This is an admirable innovation because it permits the machinery which is necessary in war to be set in motion in time of peace. That is, or ought to be, the cardinal object of all military legislation and it is the only method known whereby preparedness can be brought about. Apropos of this I want to impress upon you that the fundamentals of military organization have never been more masterfully epitomized than by Hon. John C. Calhoun in the report that he, as Secretary of War, made to Congress in December, 1820, in which he declared that "*at the commencement of hostilities there should be nothing either to new model or to create.*"

We are a long way yet from this *desideratum* and, at the present rate of Congressional progress, we shall never attain it. However, the more the war machinery can be set in motion in time of peace, the less there will remain to be done when the emergency arises. The utilization of all departments of the Government in this connection will go far to familiarize the people with the Army and consequently to popularize the military service. Even if no other result be achieved, that one object will amply justify this feature of the law.

This thought brings up a very important fact which is distinctly germaine to the subject under consideration. Of late there has

been an immense amount of discussion about the Swiss and Australian military systems, to the almost complete ignoring of the Argentine system which is equally, if not better, adapted to American requirements. About seventeen years ago tremendous opposition was raised in the Argentine Republic to the suggested introduction of compulsory military training and service. In the end the arguments of the clear-sighted statesmen who had studied international conditions prevailed, and on December 6, 1901, this system was put into effect. Within a short time the greatest opponents of compulsory training and service became its strongest supporters for the reason that they saw the inestimable benefits which it had conferred, not only on the individual, but on the nation as a whole. That system has now become part and parcel of the national life of the Argentine. In every home interest is manifested in military matters. Every man, woman and child has some relative either in the Army or the Navy, and therefore appreciates that the welfare of the soldiers and sailors is indissolubly bound up with the welfare of the community, the province and the nation. Since the inauguration of compulsory training and service in Argentina, the government of that republic has had a stability and the people have enjoyed a prosperity which they never before possessed. Crime has diminished, the rich man's son has ceased to be an idler, the manhood of the country has been improved physically and morally, and European immigrants moulded into clean, law-abiding Argentinos instead of being permitted to cling to their foreign customs and traditions. This last fact deserves strong emphasis because the immigration problem in the Argentine bears marked similarity to our own.

History repeats itself, and already strong opposition has arisen in the United States to the suggested introduction of military training and compulsory service, on the ground that it is militaristic. You and I and the most intelligent Americans know that, as a matter of fact, it is the most democratic military system yet devised.

To hark back to the National Defense Act. Steps have been taken to utilize manufacturing and other industrial plants for the production of arms, ammunition and other war *matériel*—in other words, all the elements required by the fighting men. The present European struggle has demonstrated that for every

soldier at the front, several men and women are needed in the rear in order to keep him supplied, so that he can devote himself solely to the business of fighting.

A board, supposedly non-partisan, has been created, the functions of which are to mobilize such national industries as are essential for military preparedness.

Investigations are to be made so as to ascertain whether it be desirable that the Government embark in the manufacture of arms, munitions, equipments and other war *matériel.*

Authorization has been given for the purchase of such tools, implements and machinery as may be needed for the manufacture of war *matériel.*

For years this country has been largely dependent upon Chile for its supply of sodium nitrate which is essential in the manufacture of high explosives. Since this source might readily be cut off in time of war, Congress has wisely provided for the obtaining of nitrates by our Government.

Moreover, for the first time, comprehensive measures have been taken to insure the protection of the uniform of the United States Army, Navy and Marine Corps. (Applause.) It is an abominable state of affairs that the majority of Americans have sat still all these years and made no effort whatsoever to see to it that our uniform was shielded against misuse, or that the men who wear it and who are to constitute our defense in time of war are given the recognition which they deserve. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves, every one of you. (Applause.) The idea that a soldier, a sailor or a marine who is sober and clean can be refused admittance to a theatre, opera or any other place in the country just because he is in uniform when a civilian is admitted—and sometimes a dirty, drunken or disreputable civilian—is a perfect disgrace and a blot upon American intelligence. (Applause.)

The limited time at my disposal forces me to hurry through the defects of the National Defense Act. There are so many of these defects that I could talk about them for hours and hours. (Laughter.) Under the circumstances, I will confine myself to the principal features so that you may see what Congress has actually done.

To begin with, Congress has perpetuated the dual military system with which this nation has been handicapped since the

outbreak of the Revolution. That system is composed of two sorts of forces—a Regular force or professional army on the one hand, and either militia or volunteers or both on the other. Our history shows that, in the absence of compulsion or special inducement, men will invariably enlist in the organization most lax in discipline—in other words, not in the Regular Army. And why should they, unless their love of soldiering or their desire for adventure is quite out of the ordinary, or unless— as I am sorry to say is sometimes the case—they have proved failures in civil life and enter the army as a last resort? In the Regular Army a man is necessarily subjected to stringent discipline and many restrictions. He often has to undergo great hardships, and the performance of difficult tasks is his duty and brings him little or no recognition from the public at large. In the Spanish-American war the Regulars did the work, but public enthusiasm was lavished on the volunteers almost exclusively. Many of you will recollect the drawing of Dana Gibson depicting a young woman who has manifested the keenest interest in every detail of the camp of Montauk Point and whose curiosity prompts her to inquire of a man in uniform what he is. His answer was characteristic: "I'm nothing but a Regular!"

Congress has virtually legislated against the Regular Army because under the National Defense Act, a man who enlists in the National Guard receives the same pay but is subjected to no such severe discipline as in the Regulars. Moreover, he gets a separation allowance for his family and other perquisites. Do you wonder, under the circumstances, that it is impossible to obtain the number of recruits needed by the Regular Army? Is it surprising that the first and emergency increase in the Regular Establishment, which Congress authorized in February, 1916, for the purpose of catching Villa, has never been secured, nor has Villa been caught? (Laughter.)

In this Congress of Constructive Patriotism so much has been said about the short-comings, the perniciousness of the voluntary system that I shall not dwell upon it at length. It is not only the most ineffective of military systems—so ineffective that every other great nation has rejected it as obsolete—and the most undemocratic, but it is also the most plutocratic. I emphasize this last adjective for the reason that, under the voluntary system, men are paid for the work which they undertake voluntarily and

which they ought to be obligated to perform. A Regular Army is by its very nature a mercenary force. To obtain men for such a force, it is necessary to pay them and to pay a pretty fair wage. Moreover, upon them is thrown a responsibility, a burden, a duty which ought to be shared by the entire manhood of the nation. This principle has been enunciated so often that I shall pursue it no farther beyond showing you why the voluntary system is plutocratic and puts a premium upon selfishness and shirking.

Take a concrete example. "A" may be a married man with a wife and children, a wage earner upon whom his family is dependent. Being animated by high ideals of duty and the noble motive of defending his country, he enlists and is killed, thereby sacrificing his business, his family and even his life. "B," on the other hand, may be a bachelor with no such responsibilities, but he stays at home, justifying himself by declaring, "Well, why should I have to fight? 'A' has gone and he is paid for doing it." If that isn't a plutocratic system, if that isn't a rotten system —and I use that word advisedly and purposely—I don't know what is! (Applause.) And that is the system which we Americans, with all our loud professions of democracy, have followed ever since the year 1775. (Applause.)

In this dual voluntary system, which is perpetuated by the National Defense Act, the principal dependence is placed upon the National Guard which the law contemplates increasing until it reaches a strength of 17,000 officers and 440,000 men. If recruits cannot be secured for the Regular Army by means of voluntary enlistment, we must not be deluded into believing that twice as many men can be obtained for the National Guard by the self-same method. Yet that is what Congress believes.

As many of you know, the British Navy is governed by a body called the Admiralty, which is composed of sea lords and civil lords. I have often been struck by the fact that certain terms often denote the opposite of their true meaning. In the case of the civil lords of the Admiralty, I have frequently thought that they were so entitled because they are seldom lords and never civil. (Laughter.) By the same reasoning, it has always seemed to be that the National Guard is so called because it is not national, it is not a guard, and it is of no use to the nation as a whole until its status has been changed from a State to a Federal force. (Applause.) That is something which cannot be

effectively done without an amendment to the Constitution. Congress tried to Federalize these troops—its failure became apparent from the pathetic state of affairs which has recently been witnessed on the Mexican border. The Constitution expressly limits the training of the militia and the appointment of its officers to the States. The wise framers of our Government clearly intended that the militia was to be a State force, but Congress has now undertaken to undermine that restriction and to make the militia serve two masters at once. This attempt reminds me of the observation made by some wag: "No wonder that Rome fell, trying to sit on seven hills at once!" As might have been expected, the militia system has fallen down completely at the present time, just as it has always done in the past and as it is bound to do in the future, because it is fundamentally unsound.

In innumerable other ways, which I have not time to explain here, the National Defense Act has failed of its alleged purpose. The General Staff, whose function it is to formulate our military policy, to prepare plans for war and to give advice as to what ought to be done in the matter of preparedness, has been virtually cut in half and its efficiency seriously impaired. Congress has forbidden more than half the officers of this all-important corps from being stationed in or near the District of Columbia, where the national capital, the War Department, the Army War College and the headquarters of the General Staff are all located, and where the President and the Secretary of War are to be found. Perhaps Congress imposed this restriction because it was afraid that the General Staff might wield too much power and perform its functions properly. (Laughter.) A fair example of the detrimental effect of this last legislation is that the information concerning the European war collected in large quantity and at great expense by our military attachés abroad has thus far merely been filed and catalogued, for the reason that, under the restrictions imposed, only one officer of the General Staff has been available to handle this data, which ought to have been thoroughly analyzed and studied because it possesses untold value for our Army and may be vital to the nation in the event of war.

The permanent establishment of training camps for civilians, similar to those at Plattsburg, will be a valuable factor, as I can

testify from personal experience, but too much reliance must not be placed upon their output as an effective military asset. The same warning ought to be made about the so-called National Guard. To be sure, the National Defense Act requires that its former training be doubled but, even so, that schooling is confined to about 192 hours *per annum*. In the light of the European war, Switzerland has found it necessary to increase the training of her troops to 1,600 hours, while some of the belligerants now consider that nothing short of 4,000 hours of intensive training will suffice to make a first-class fighting man. The plain truth is that the National Guard is of little or no value as a national military asset. Its adherents may contend that if the mobilization last summer had not begun just fifteen days after the new law went into effect, a different condition would have been witnessed. That threadbare argument has been repeated ever since the beginning of the Revolution; no end of legislation seeking to improve the militia has been passed; Federal assistance, financial and otherwise, has been given it unstintingly; but the fact none the less remains that to-day the system is just as faulty as ever, and the National Guard is little more than a broken reed.

In making these criticisms, I wish to state emphatically that I am not attacking these patriotic officers and men individually. By failing to exert the proper pressure on Congress, we Americans have permitted the perpetuation of a system fundamentally vicious—a system which has recently forced them to bear the brunt of the work which ought to have been shared by the manhood of the country. Don't blame the National Guard, but blame the system by which they have been handicapped for a century and a quarter and under which they have more than once been the chief victims. (Applause.)

The worst part of the National Defense Act is contained in that section which provides for pay for the organized militia. I have told you that the "pork barrel" was open at both ends. Under the item of pay alone the expenditures may reach a total of $75,000,000 a year. The framers of the Constitution prohibited officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army and Navy from holding offices of profit and trust in the public service. Almost every state forbids them from acquiring legal residence or domicile arising out of service within the state. As a con-

sequence the officers and men of the military and naval services are virtually debarred from exercising the right of franchise. Throughout our history we have guarded with scrupulous care against the evil of militarism, yet the present Congress has created, perhaps unwittingly, a political-military caste which may prove a serious menace to popular liberty. The Constitution prohibits the appropriation of money for the Regular Army for any period in excess of two years. None of these safeguards are applicable to the National Guard under the present law. Its officers and men exercise the right of franchise unrestricted; many of them hold offices of profit and trust under the Federal and State governments; and no limitation is imposed as to the term for which appropriations for the National Guard can be made. Under this legislation a political-military machine can be constructed, which will be a curse from a political standpoint and a menace to military efficiency—indeed, it will virtually destroy military efficiency. It is impossible for me to lay too much stress upon this feature of the National Defense Act—a feature fraught with utmost danger to the country because it makes possible the very militarism against which we have guarded so jealously since the beginning of our national career.

By contrast to this feature, which alone would justify the condemnation of the entire measure, I want to point out one notable achievement by Congress in this last military legislation. In appreciating that a militia system based upon voluntary service alone is unsound and has invariably broken down in time of crisis, and by authorizing the use of the draft in time of peace—a proceeding never before resorted to in our military methods—Congress has performed a signal service to the country in laying the foundation for universal training and compulsory service. (Applause.)

When the time arrives that Congress stands ready to do its duty to the country in the matter of proper national defense, the first thing that we need is sound military policy. We have never had such a policy and, in consequence, have been like a ship without a rudder in this respect. We want a proper military policy, together with the means to insure its continuity so that it shall not be one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow. That is the first essential.

Secondly, we must have in effective operation a system of universal training for national defense, coupled with the obligation of service in time of war, according to each man's capacity, up to the age of forty-five.

Thirdly, we want a Regular Army sufficiently large to constitute, together with its trained reserves, the first line of defense. This force should furnish the garrisons for our overseas possessions and the instructions required to train the manhood of the nation, and such expeditionary forces as may be needed. It should also form the nucleus for the various lines of defense.

Fourthly, we want a force of citizen soldiers, obtained through the medium of universal training and compulsory service, large enough to constitute our second and subsequent lines of defense. This force ought to be comprised of all physically fit young men of the nation, trained at the non-productive stage of their lives—in other words, before they have reached the age of twenty-three. Just as soon as they have received the requisite training, they should be transferred to the reserves and permitted to return to their civil pursuits.

Lastly, we want all these forces thoroughly organized according to the best military standards. To render this organization effective, all our national resources and industries should be mobilized and organized so that in the event of war the nation may be able to put forth its full strength and thus insure eventual success.

I want to impress upon you one cardinal essential, which is that *"a nation's military power is to be measured not by the total number of its male citizens capable of bearing arms, but by the number of trained soldiers with which it can meet a given emergency."* Military efficiency depends upon training and organization. Once these two factors are in proper working order, we shall act, when war comes, as an integrated nation, not as a disintegrated collection of states and individuals with conflicting interests. We shall then exemplify our national motto, *"E pluribus unum,"* and ours will be a country in which the waving of flags and Fourth of July enthusiasm will be far exceeded by that silent patriotism, that willingness on the part of each one to do his share which alone makes a nation truly great and powerful, because it proceeds from a realization that if a coun-

try is worth living in, it is worth living for, worth working for, worth making any sacrifice for. (Loud applause.)

CHAIRMAN NICHOLS: It is a matter of great regret to us all that the chief speaker of the afternoon, Senator Borah, has been detained. In the meantime, a business meeting of our Congress will be held.

I bring to you, if presentation be necessary, Mr. S. Stanwood Menken, First Vice-President of the National Security League, its active head, and the Chairman of the Executive Committee, a man who has made this gathering possible, and who can give an illustration in his own person of what patriotism means. (Applause.)

MR. MENKEN: Before calling upon one of the Chairmen of Committees for a report, I want to express, and I want you, by motion from the floor, to voice our sense of deep appreciation to the Daughters of the American Revolution for the courtesy that they have extended through their President, Mrs. Story, which has made possible the convenient holding of these meetings in this great and beautiful temple of patriotism. (Loud applause.)

MR. A. L. PERHAM: I make such a motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALKER: I second the motion.

MR. MENKEN: It has been moved and seconded that the Executive Committee be requested to communicate your thanks and the appreciation of the Congress to the Daughters of the American Revolution. Do I phrase your motion correctly?

MR. PERHAM: You have.

MR. MENKEN: All those in favor of the motion will signify by saying "Aye." Contrary "No." The motion prevails.

I wanted to preside at this meeting in spite of my voice—because I desired to be present at the birth of that idea which I felt had more of import to the American people than anything else that had been presented in our generation, and that is a system for the development of patriotism through education.

It is with a sense of very keen gratification that I have the honor to present to you the Chairman of that Committee, who has labored, not alone here, but for many weeks, in developing the plan which will now be presented to you.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I present Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard University, Chairman of the Committee on Patriotism through Education. (Loud applause.)

ADDRESS

Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, Chairman of the Committee on Patriotism Through Education, Professor of Government in Harvard University

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Patriots: The idea of which Mr. Menken speaks had its origin within a few feet of this spot, for Mr. Menken is like that Russian hero, who took his hammer, rapped, and out came a ship. "He rapped a hundred times and made a hundred ships." "Rap, tap," says Mr. Menken, and out came the National Security League. (Applause.) If he will only tap a hundred times, he will produce a Finance Committee of one hundred, every one with a ten thousand dollar bill in his vest pocket. (Applause.)

It becomes my duty and pleasure to present to you a report which is in the hands of many of you in print, and which, therefore, needs no elaborate description. It is the work of about eighty different individuals, working in conference in Boston, in New York and in Washington, including representatives of all parts of the country. They are men and women of different points of view, who, however, have united without dissent in the presentation of the plan which is here laid before you. You have it first, in extenso, and second, in the one-page summary, which places before you the whole plan.

The motto of this plan might well be: "If the Good Samaritan had started earlier in the morning, he would have saved a hotel bill, (laughter) to say nothing of saving the wounds of the man who fell among thieves." Did you ever think of it? If the Good Samaritan, the type of human love of one's kind, and his friends, had properly organized the government of Judea, there would have been no thieves upon that road, there would have been no robbery, no attempted murder, only a great saving of expense to the state and of suffering to human beings; there might have been peace and comfort, if there had been a sufficient police force. (Applause.)

It is the purpose of the Committee whose report lies before you, to go as far as is humanly possible in the direction of presenting to our fellow-Americans a method by which they may be induced to put their minds upon this great need of National self-defense. At the outset let me say that, so far as I have been able to gauge the purposes of the members of the Committee, from which this report springs, it is not in their minds a project for aiding militarism. On the contrary, you will find everywhere in the pages of this report the suggestion that it is the belief of the Committee, which we assume to be likewise the belief of the National Security League, that a proper military commercial and social organization will make wars between this country and others unnecessary. (Applause.)

What we are urging is not that we shall take up a jingo position, to challenge our neighbors, but that we shall forever put an end to the daily and hourly danger in which our beloved country now lies. Some nations as great as the United States of America have perished and gone to the dust, because the good Samaritan started too late in the morning. (Applause.)

The report which you have before you includes three main topics, besides which we have put on record the manner in which the report has been produced. It is a composite work, in which many persons have made suggestions; those have been sifted, analyzed, and as far as possible, grouped together, so as to make a clear impression upon the minds of those concerned. I call your attention as to the statement of the purpose of the Committee upon page one, as a kind of an announcement, a foreword for the whole movement.

The first significant point is, what can be said? what propaganda can be carried on? what effort can be made to arouse the minds of our fellow countrymen? We have assembled a list of subjects which seem to us to be cognate to the work of popular education in self-defense. At the head stands The Spirit of Patriotism, and we (page 2 of the report) have briefly defined what seem to us the main conditions of patriotism.

The second issue of importance is the great question of national efficiency. It is the belief of those who have prepared this report, and, if the organization goes into effect, it will doubtless be the teaching of those who carry it on, that preparedness, defense, patriotism, are not simply matters of soldiers and

sailors, and rifles and ships and fortifications, but that they involve taking the resources and powers of our country and so organizing them that whenever needed they may be used for any great national purpose. (Applause.)

We propose to teach national efficiency upon a great scale: the efficiency of government, the efficiency of private corporations, the efficiency of all the instrumentalities for collecting and applying the resources of a country which has now come to be the richest on earth. What we demand, Mr. Chairman, what we desire to call to the attention of the American people, is that they absolutely must—not "they ought," but "they must"—devote to public questions, to the solution of the needs of the individual the same degree of foresight, the same care as to details and the same effort to provide long in advance for dangers and contingencies, which is exacted of the managers of great commercial and industrial enterprises. Imagine a great mining company, like Calumet and Hecla, putting down a shaft here and a shaft there, but never making a plan of their property, never knowing where they were going, never guessing how much copper there might be within reach.

We want in public affairs the same degree and the same kind of application of the powers of the human mind to problems, and to the necessities of the future, that we absolutely demand of the men to whom we give money, as stockholders in companies, in order that they may invest it for our benefit. (Applause.) We desire in any teaching that may proceed, in any appeal to the public following the work of this Committee, to bring out the necessity of commercial, industrial, and personal efficiency.

Again, it is the belief of this Committee that one of the main difficulties with Americans in these respects is that they are not fond of looking at all the truths that bear upon the questions which they must solve, that our public deliberative bodies are often satisfied with makeshifts. What is the reason for the amazing efficiency of three or four of the great European governments now engaged in the war? It is because months and years in advance they have sat down to work out the solutions and have settled their problems.

Imagine a man starting with a caravan of wagons across the prairies without knowing, first whether there were any rivers there; then whether there were bridges, or what were the fords.

The efficient peoples like an efficient individual, are those that count the cost, that look over the ground, that size the difficulties, that realize the conditions in which they live.

Particularly it is time that Americans should be better acquainted with the defensive needs of their own country, with the facts, the plain facts, that neither in army, nor in fortifications, nor in the navy, nor in the degree and perfection of the training of our troops, nor in the number of trained officers, can the United States dream of competing with nations half its size.

And that brings us to the special question of universal military training. It is a dangerous thing to disagree with General Nichols—I have never ventured it before; yet I would like to cling to the term "universal military training" rather than "universal military service," for the reason that the service may not be called for, but the training is essential. (Applause.) It is needed irrespective of the service. We call for it not alone because the three sister nations, Switzerland, Australia and Argentina, have adopted that type of training to give to every able-bodied young man a chance to develop himself physically and to acquire some knowledge of the military art, would be important if there never were to be a war again.

Should universal world peace be accomplished in spite of all the difficulties in the way, there would still remain the moral duty of giving to our young men physical set-up and a sense of responsibility and discipline. You will observe, if you glance at the report, that in the opinion of the Committee there is also a training of girls that can be developed upon different lines, but still with reference to the service they may render to their country in time of stress. (Applause.)

Suppose a great earthquake rocks the land or that a terrible tempest, by which millions would lose their homes, should sweep over the land, or suppose there were a war, in any such disaster we want our girls to be prepared beforehand, and not to learn to be nurses after they enter a hospital (applause), not to learn how to cook after they go into a military kitchen, but to learn beforehand, so that they may serve when the crisis comes.

I call your particular attention to the fact that (page 4, under F-6) the committee at the last moment decided to omit from the printed report the phrase: "If accomplished, necessary to

provide the quota of the United States for a world force." I might say that a distinguished publicist of Washington seemed to show a remarkable fondness for those words; at least he desired to deprive the Committee of their use. That is hardly a fair statement? The truth is that the Committee discovered that the words which it had used seemed to convey an impression which was not in their minds.

An unaccountable thing about this universal military training is, that people in different parts of this country talk as if it were a new, an unheard of idea. Every male sitting before me was born with an obligation to a military service to his country. (Applause.) A large part of the men here are still legally bound to that service, if called upon. What we ask is, not that we shall establish a new servitude upon our boys, but that the obligations with which they are born and for which their country looks to them, may be efficiently rendered. (Applause.) We ask only that when the country needs young men, it shall find trained young men for its service.

I might say with regard to this part of the report, that of the eighty people whose opinion was asked upon that subject so far as I remember, only four expressed doubt as to universal military training. Upon the final test vote, taken yesterday in Washington, in a representative Committee of fifty-five persons, fifty-five voted that universal military training was a necessary part of any message which this Committee might carry to the people, and not one single vote or voice was given in that Committee against the plan. (Applause.)

Yet this was not at all a jingo body. I felt, looking at them, as I feel looking at you, like the ladies in a Southern railway station a few years ago, who were heard by the person concerned, a highly respectable citizen of New York to say, "Yes, yes; that's him. That's a grandson of William Lloyd Garrison, yet he hasn't a bad face after all." (Laughter.)

So you are known according to the newspapers throughout the country as a band of militarists and jingoes; and yet, I must confess, you haven't a bad set of faces after all.

So it was that a committee composed of men, women, educators, business men, engineers, and professional men of various kinds, chosen without the slightest reference to their opinion upon universal military training yet agreed unanimously that if

anything is to be taught to the American nation—and we are going to teach something—universal military training must be included.

In the second large section of the report we have tried to work out a summary of the possible activities of an organization. You will see a long list of things that may be done; some of them absolutely must be done; some of them may possibly be postponed; but, I believe that every one of them is worth doing.

They include, especially co-operation with other agencies. It is the purpose of the Committee which has framed this method, that so far as possible advantage shall be taken of every other organization that looks in the same direction, to avail ourselves of their aid and experience. Their understanding and co-operation is sought. We want the aid of every man, woman and child, and of every society of every kind in the United States which feels, as we do, the importance of making up the American people.

It is not simply a question of defense against a possible enemy, not merely a defense of your hearths and homes, it is a necessity that the American people find themselves, realize their own power and potentiality, their mission within their own borders and their place upon the earth. That is what we want to inculcate. (Applause.) We want to co-operate with and aid all forms of education now on foot; we want to foment public discussion, in which we feel confident that the champions of our principles ought before any impartial audience to be successful in their arguments. If the other side has a better argument than we and we dare not enter such contests, then we may honorably disband.

Again, we feel that here is an opportunity for the preparation of material which will be of service in this propaganda. The most probable immediate form of action undoubtedly will be a comprehensive system of lectures and addresses throughout the length and breadth of the land. It is possible by taking counsel of those whose profession it is to enter on such enterprises, such as the great fraternal orders, to go through the country and secure five hundred thousand, six hundred thousand, a million of a preparedness organization.

If this League desires, an immediate effort may be made, for instance, to come into relation with the labor people, through

those who represent them; to find what they think about it, what difficulties they suggest, what can be done toward meeting their minds, and how to set before them the truth, that a defended America is a better America for the laboring man. Above all, it is ours to teach them an efficient America, in which every man shall have the best possible chance for doing what lies within his physical and mental powers, is a far better place for every American than a weak and undefended America. National existence depends upon the pre-occupations and the combinations of other nations. Their indisposition to molest us is gratifying, (Applause) because, great as we are, with our hundred million people, and potentiality of an army of ten million men, great as we are, any two great powers in the world who are to unite to attack us at the same time, would find us totally unprepared to keep them from our shores or to protect our own institutions from destruction.

We desire to use the press, we desire to use the popular methods of appeal to the eye, we hope to have a movie which will surpass any movie of a similar kind that has ever been made, and which will make clear to the American people what sort of folks they are. (Applause.)

Surely, how shall this great plan be carried out? Upon the last page of the report you have a brief statement of a proposed form of permanent organization, which, of course, this committee has no authority to promulgate. It simply proposes it for the consideration of the Executive Committee of the National Security League at large. We do not stand upon details of any kind. There isn't a line of this report that might not be altered. Certain paragraphs, could not be cut out, as, for instance, on universal military training. But the report insists, not that the thing shall be done in a particular way, but that it shall be done.

What we ask of you, Mr. Chairman, is that the National Security League will create an instrumentality of this kind or something like it, or of any kind which will enable us as a League, and as an Association of patriotic people, to go to our fellow Americans and to say, "We are all patriots together." God forbid that any such movement should be a vehicle of politics, or that it should be simply a machine for criticism, like the New York Nation. What we want is to coincide, to agree with people. Above all, we do not come before the American

people to attack their representatives and their institutions; we hope to perfect them, not to destroy.

We will make war relentlessly, so far as we can, upon any individual and any public body that distinctly and directly sets itself against the proper protection of our own country. (Loud applause.) We have no quarrel with the Legislature, no quarrel with Congress, and no quarrel with any official of the government. We are simply trying to make the American people discontented with representatives who are trying to live on the principles of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, instead of this great, glorious, potential twentieth century. (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, we believe you will find the necessary money. The country at large must have the opportunity for learning to know itself, for appreciating both its weakness and its strength, for understanding the necessity that all Americans, wherever born, whatever their original language and race, shall stand together in the defense of their beloved country. Defense in peace against waste and want; defense, if there be war, against the dangers of that dreadful catastrophe. (Loud applause.)

MR. MENKEN: Ladies and Gentlemen, the report of the Committee on Resolutions is next in order. I have the honor to present to you as Chairman of that Committee, Mr. Guy Murchie, President of the Massachusetts Division of the National Security League. (Applause.)

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Guy Murchie, Chairman, President of the Boston Branch of the National Security League

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have the honor to present for the Committee on Resolutions, two resolutions. One is a special resolution, and the other one the general statement of principles which have been approved by that Committee. The first resolution is as follows:

> "RESOLVED, That in the death of Superintendent Ben Blewett of St. Louis, this Congress has lost one of its most conscientious and zealous members. In this testimonial we mingle our sorrow with that of the City of St. Louis, which Superintendent Blewett defended by a long career of splendid educational leadership.

"We are also mindful that the passing of Superintendent Blewett removes a man whose professional influence has not been merely local. For many years he has exerted an enlightened and constructive influence upon public educational policies throughout the United States.

"The manner of Superintendent Blewett's death was an appropriate and enviable close of an exemplary life, as educator and citizen. He was speaking in Committee upon plans for making the public schools of our country more efficient in developing patriotism. His last words, cut short by death, were in highest praise of the efforts of the women teachers of America to inculcate the spirit of loyalty and devotion.

"RESOLVED, That this minute be spread upon the records of this Congress of Constructive Patriotism and of the National Security League, and that copies be sent to the family of Superintendent Blewett, to the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, and to the National Educational Association."

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this resolution.

MR. MENKEN: Is the resolution seconded?

A MEMBER: I second the motion.

MR. MENKEN: All those in favor of this resolution signify by saying "Aye." Contrary "No." It is a unanimous vote.

(Mr. Murchie here read the Statement of Principles adopted by the Resolutions Committee and reported on by the Resolutions Committee. The statement is printed in full, as finally adopted, at the beginning of this volume.)

MR. MURCHIE: I move the adoption of this report.

MR. MENKEN: You have heard the report, what is your pleasure? Is there a second?

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. HUIDEKOPER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to the fact that the last word should be "defense," and not "force"—"to provide the troops and equipment necessary for an effective land defense."

MR. MENKEN: Is the amendment accepted, Mr. Murchie?

MR. MURCHIE: Yes.

GEN. MAXWELL VAN ZANDT WOODHULL arose.

MR. MENKEN: The amendment is accepted. I am going to ask, in order that the records may be clear, that anyone who speaks will do two things: Firstly, give us the benefit of his name—I happen to know this is General Woodhull—and, secondly, observe the rule, which will be impartially and strictly enforced, of a five-minute limitation.

GENERAL WOODHULL: This is in reference to the excellent recommendation in reference to the strength of our army and to the strength of our naval power on both the Atlantic and the Pacific Coast:

RESOLVED that it is the opinion of this Congress that

FIRST. The enlisted force of the Army, of the Navy and of the Marine Corps, should be raised by conscription, the annual drawings for these services to maintain them respectively at full war strength.

SECOND. That the strength of the Regular Army should be a million men, of whom 200,000 should constitute the active army, and 800,000 the reserve army.

THIRD. That the term of service of the active army should be five years with the colors, and of the reserve army one year with the colors, under intensive training and discipline, and thereafter four years in the reserve, with at least three weeks' training with the colors each year of reserve service; and as part of the regular army of the United States the reserve army to receive the same pay and allowances as the active army.

FOURTH. That a corps of one year volunteers be created, who should serve with the colors under intensive instructions and discipline for one year without compensation, who at the end of such year's service, should be examined for promotion, and who thereafter for the period of five years should be subject to the call of the President for service as officers of the Reserve Army.

I move the adoption of this resolution:

MR. MENKEN: Do you propose this as an amendment, sir?

GENERAL WOODHULL: No, this is not an amendment.

MR. MENKEN: Is this seconded?

(The motion was duly seconded.)

A MEMBER: I move the resolution be tabled.

MR. MENKEN: The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, a motion to lay an amendment on the table takes with it the original question.

MR. MENKEN: The ruling of the Chair is that a motion to lay on the table is not debatable. (Applause.)

GENERAL WOODHULL: I didn't put up this proposition to have it summarily laid on the table. It is certainly fair.

MR. MENKEN: All right, if that is the sense, we will waive the rule. I want to say, however, that a motion to lay on the table is not going to be debatable in this meeting.

A DELEGATE: I move that the resolution be stricken out entirely.

MR. MENKEN: Wait a moment. General Woodhull, do you want to discuss your resolution?

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, in order that everybody may understand the General's motion, that it be read in a loud and distinct voice, so that everybody can understand what it is?

(The resolution was again read by General Woodhull.)

GENERAL WOODHULL.: You will note, Mr. Chairman, from this resolution, that I believe that the only way to create and to maintain an army and a navy is through conscription. The day of the volunteer soldier and sailor has passed, because war now bursts upon the world with a suddenness and fury which demands that the creative work of organizing armies and navies shall be done in time of peace to insure victory in war. No other way of creating armies than through conscription, has been devised by any one of the great military powers, and that for us to hold back from conscription is to prepare the way for inevitable national defeat in war when war shall come.

The last Annual Report of the Chief of Staff of the Army demonstrates that dependence on voluntary enlistment to supply the regular army with recruits is no longer possible. On March 17, 1916, Congress passed an emergency act increasing the regular army by 20,000 men, and the full resources of the War Department were at once set to work to recruit these additional troops. The failure of these efforts of the army is indicated in the following words from the Report of the Chief of Staff, "leaving a difference on August 31, 1916, of 29,130 between the *actual* and the *authorized* strength" of the army.

In addition to this reported shortage of 29,130 men in the army on August 31, 1916, it is well understood that a similar shortage of sailors in the navy of from 20,000 to 25,000 men exists, and that our new ships can only be put in commission by drawing their crews from ships already in service, which ships, on the loss of their crews, are necessarily then withdrawn from active service.

You will also note that I do not believe that the plan of universal military training and service for which this Congress stands, will give us dependable armies which could maintain themselves in the field against a well-trained and disciplined German army led by such a fine and merciless soldier as von Hindenberg. Your troops created under the plan of this Congress would be driven before von Hindenberg's bayonets as chaff is driven before the wind.

I heartily approve the proposition of this Congress that our navy in the Atlantic should be at least the second largest navy in that ocean, and that in the Pacific Ocean our naval strength should put us in the first rank. But I fear that that is a programme beyond attainment in any reasonable length of time.

But be assured of one thing, that unless we shall be at least as strong in the Atlantic and in the Pacific as this resolution would make us, we should lose the Panama Canal in the first six months of war with one of the great powers; and that within the first two months of the war, the enemy having effected a landing on our coast, would be in possession of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington, holding these cities under contribution, unless, indeed, we should have allies capable of lending efficient support with their fleets.

I would also, Mr. Chairman, ask your attention and the attention of the Congress, to the length of time that it takes to create a soldier, and to create the military organisms which compose armies.

At the meeting of the sub-committee of this Congress on Military Affairs, one of the members of the Committee said that he had had a recent conversation with Major General Wood of the Army, who told him that he had discovered that soldiers can be made in much shorter time than one year, the period heretofore deemed to be the minimum period of time in which soldiers can be created under intensive training and discipline. Assuming that General Wood was correctly reported, I have simply to say that General Wood is wrong in his conclusions: quite as wrong as the Congress is in believing that its nebulous programme of universal compulsory military training and service will produce dependable soldiers and armies.

The minimum period in which soldiers can be created is one year. This period of training with the colors in the great nations

of Europe is two years, and in France three years with the colors. Even if we should give our troops, drawn under conscription, one year's intensive training with the colors, we should have soldiers under-trained in comparison with the best soldiers of the great military powers of the world.

I shall conclude my remarks by reading an extract upon this point from the last admirable report of Major General Hugh L. Scott, the Chief of Staff of the Army, with which I agree, except that I believe that *the trained and disciplined individuality* of our soldiers is equivalent to a superiority over the peasants of Europe of about 25 per cent.

This relative superiority in *the trained and disciplined individuality* of our soldiers may be taken as having been demonstrated in the great war in this country between 1861-65, and consequently I think it should be given due weight in this consideration.

Major General Scott says:

"The debate in Congress and the discussion in the press of the country indicated that there is a very widespread, serious and vital misconception in this country in regard to the time it takes to train the individual soldier and the organization of which he is an element.

"In the belief that soldiers can be very quickly trained and armies improvised, we not only run counter to the military opinion and practice of practically all the other great nations of the world, but we run counter as well to our own experience as a nation in war. The time required for the training of armies depends largely on the presence or absence of trained officers and noncommissioned officers. If there be a corps of trained officers and noncommissioned officers and a tested organization of higher units with trained leaders and staff officers, the problem of training is largely limited to the training of the private soldier. This has been satisfactorily accomplished in Europe as is being demonstrated in the present war by giving the soldiers in time of peace two years of intensive training with the colors and additional training in the reserve.

"It should be obvious to any unprejudiced mind that if we are to *defeat* highly trained and splendidly disciplined armies of our possible enemies, or own forces when called upon for battle should have training and discipline at least equal to that of our opponent. While we have splendid material for soldiers, for us seriously to claim that the average American youth can be trained and disciplined in less time than the average English, French, German, or Japanese youth argues a decided lack of understanding on the part of our people of the progress and character of the English, French, German, or Japanese people. All that we can hope for and confidently claim is that,

given equal intensive training as to time, under equally favorable conditions as to officers and noncommissioned officers for instructors and leaders, our soldiers will be prepared to assure in war the success of our armies.

"Under their system of intensive training other nations require approximately 6 hours' daily work in theoretical and practical instruction of each soldier, or approximately 4,000 hours during the 2-year period of training. In our Regular Service, due to the necessity of depending on volunteer enlistment, we require in 3 years approximately the same number of hours that the army in which universal and compulsory service exist obtains in 2 years.

"If we continue to accept approximately 4,000 hours as our standards of training and discipline, we will meet our opponents on practically equal terms, providing that the quality of our instructors and leaders is up to their standard. If we adopt a lower standard of training, we lessen directly the fighting efficiency of our troops.

"It should be clear that troops trained for 1 year of intensive training, or approximately for 2,000 hours, are only *one-half* as well trained and *less than one-half* as well disciplined as they would be if they had 4,000 hours of training in 2 years. It is obvious that troops trained for only 1 year in time of peace will have to be given additional training in time of war before they can successfully oppose troops with the high standard of training and discipline that is given in 2 years in time of peace, and that we will have to make up for any deficiency in training and discipline by decided superiority in numbers."

PROF. WILLIAM H. HOBBS (of the University of Michigan): Mr. Chairman, I want to submit that details concerning the size of the American army are no part of the business of this Congress.

(Cries of "right" and applause.)

I want further to say that General Woodhull was a member of the original committee which drafted the resolution. He had an opportunity to bring up the matter there. It was amply discussed. It was brought into the Committee of Delegates and it was there further discussed at great length, and was voted down with practically no support. It seems to me it is not our business to further discuss that matter. (Applause.)

A DELEGATE: I second Prof. Hobbs' motion.

MR. MENKEN: We have the question of laying the amendment proposed by General Woodhull on the table. All those in favor please say "Aye." Contrary "No." The motion seems to be, and is carried, to lay General Woodhull's motion on the table.

Now, we are going to take this thing up with some regularity. As to the preamble to the resolution, is there any discussion? If not——

A DELEGATE: I would like to have the preamble read.

MR. MENKEN: Well, we have had it; it is very long. If anybody wants it, here is a printed copy.

A DELEGATE: I move that the preamble be adopted.

MR. MENKEN: Well, we will adopt it at the end. I just want it offered for discussion, and avoid having a great variety of motions.

COL. JEWETT (of Indiana): The little I have to say will be said from where I stand. I have been encouraged by attendance at this wonderful Congress and by contact with the fine men and splendid women, and I think a few moments might be well spent in one or two practical suggestions as to how this patriotic, self-sacrificing, surpassing ideal might be given practical force and effect. (Applause.)

I think the League lacks one thing, and that isn't a President or a more capable and engaging Secretary, for these two, in my judgment, could not be improved upon, and I have seen a good many presidents and secretaries in my time. (Applause.) But we have been now for three days in session, and I say to you, to those assembled, that in my judgment this convention, this Congress, should be the center of interest to the people of the whole United States. (Applause.)

I say that it should be the central interest to the Senate and the House of Representatives now sitting on the hill in the Capitol. But with equal sincerity and earnestness, I don't think that those things exist. I suggest in a practical manner, and I will give an illustration. I heard your wonderful address, sir, at the opening of this Congress. But those who were denied that high privilege don't know what you said.

The Congressmen who read the Washington papers cannot grasp in any way the breadth, the wealth, the patriotism and strength and enlightened information which that contains. What the National Security League needs at its next meeting is a press agent. (Loud applause.)

I don't live on the Atlantic Coast. I live at the center of the population of the United States. (Applause.) The State from which I hail has for twenty years been the center of population.

So I say that somebody besides me and one other gentleman who is here from Indiana ought to know something of what is going on in this Congress.

There are one or two other suggestions——

(A motion was made and seconded that Col. Jewett be allowed to continue speaking.)

MR. MENKEN: Well, if you will state them briefly. (Applause.)

The motion was carried.

COL. JEWETT: Mr. President, it is very flattering, and I am glad that I struck a responsive chord upon a thing which I think is of vital importance, but if the Chair says that I shall stop, why, I think I ought to stop.

Now, this Congress has been engaged in a work that concededly is the most tremendous question now before the American people; but, Mr. Chairman, it is not before the American people.

As I said, I live in the center of population, and there are not, I venture to say, five hundred voters in the great State of Indiana—for Indiana is a mighty big State—who have had their attention directed to this, or who have felt one iota of the noble aspiration that fills your heart and the hearts of those over whom you preside. We want to get this thing before the people. (Applause.) What little profit will it be if all the wonderful addresses made here are only for our own eager and sympathetic ears?

We want them to go before the people. I am a practical man, not a warrior. I have only been through two wars, but I am not of that profession any more. I know that the people of the Atlantic Coast are quite well informed and that on the Pacific Coast, where my principal interests lie, they are quite well scared. It is the great land that lies between that must be interested, because the people there have great weight in Congress. Nothing but the sentiment of those who do the voting ever stirred Congress to brave, independent, constructive legislation. (Applause.)

Unless the purpose of the Congress is known, when I return home—and I speak of this, and I always shall, in terms of the highest praise—I will be, by the ordinary crowd, supposed to be in favor of conscription. And their idea of conscription is the

old-world idea of long service away from life and beauty and home, and not the noble ideas here, which will give to every young man of nineteen years of age healthiness, loyalty, and patriotic training in six months, and you can train any private soldier in six months. I thank you, Mr. President. (Applause.)

MR. MENKEN: Colonel, you proved the case for the need of patriotism through education.

PROF. HART: Mr. Chairman, I move the enlistment of the first recruit for that movement in the person of Col. Jewett of Indiana. (Applause.)

COL. JEWETT: My friends, I enlisted at fourteen, and then I was commissioned in another war at forty-eight. (Applause.)

GEN. W. H. BIXBY (Washington, D. C.): Mr. President, I take the liberty of adding to that, that there will be no difficulty whatever with the press work, if the members of the League will respond to those invitations that have been sent out in the last few days to make liberal contributions. (Laughter and applause.)

MR. MENKEN: Thank you. I want to say that Dr. Burr is from one of our very best branches in Michigan.

DR. BURR: There is a matter here that seems to me of vital importance——

MR. MENKEN: Excuse me, Dr. Burr, are you speaking on the preamble?

DR. BURR: I am speaking on the resolution.

MR. MENKEN: But I want it followed section by section. We will recognize you again, but let us go ahead.

Now, coming to the clause, "Patriotism Through Education," is there any discussion? If not, we will pass to the second clause, "Development of Woman Forces." Then Section 3, "Universal Military Training."

MR. EVANS (Philadelphia): If I understand correctly, there is a provision that there shall be no payment for service in training. Is that correct?

MR. MENKEN: While in training.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think that is an unfortunate and inelastic provision to insert in these resolutions. I make the suggestion that a modified phrase should be inserted there, "preferentially, without pay," instead of rigidly "without pay."

MR. MENKEN: Is Mr. Evans' motion, that for the words "no pay" there be substituted the words, "preferentially no pay" seconded?

MR. FERGUSON: I second Mr. Evans' motion.

MR. MENKEN: Has the Committee any view on that matter; do they accept it or not? Mr. Murchie has the floor on behalf of the Committee on Resolutions.

I want to say just one word. You know every one of these resolutions represents the work of different committees. In other words, the Americanization Committee presented its plan, the Army Committee its plan, the Navy Committee its plan, and while the Resolutions Committee was a body of twenty-five or thirty men, they have had the benefit of the active thought and action of over 250 members at this gathering.

MR. MURCHIE: Mr. Menken, I think it fair to say to the Congress that the Committee on Universal Military Training was headed by Mr. Stimson, formerly Secretary of War, and that he gave an important amount of work and thought to it, as did other members of the Committee.

This report, as embodied in "1" should be paragraph "3"; the heading should go back there to where No. "3" is, the title "Universal Military Training" at the foot of the first page, or the top of the far half of sheet. As the section is worded it is verbatim the report of that important committee. It was very thoroughly discussed last night by the full Committee on Resolutions until twelve or one o'clock, and was finally adopted as it now stands. Mr. Stimson should be here to speak for it so much better than I can.

But as I caught the discussion at that meeting it was this, that to state a principle was the important position of this Congress, and that it was undesirable to compromise that principle. It is certainly true that no pay in an army where rich and poor are to serve, in an army where every man is supposed to owe, without pay, his allegiance to his country, is more to be desired.

What Congress may do to modify this statement of principles embodied in the report of the Military Committee to the Committee on Resolutions, we cannot say. But I feel that we can go out better to the country in this statement of principle, if we do not intend to compromise on our ideal. (Applause.)

A DELEGATE: I move the question.

MR. MENKEN: Is there any further discussion?

GEN. C. B. DOUGHERTY (of Wilkesbarre, Pa.): I heard the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee state here just now that all these matters were fully and fairly considered in committee meetings. There are some gentlemen present who know that the discussions in the Committee on Resolutions were shut off—not on this matter particularly, but discussions were limited. In rising to second Mr. Evans' motion, I would like to state that a gentleman who is unknown to me stated to me that he is an employer of labor and that there is some distinction in the mind of the poor man as to compensation as against the rich man who can serve without pay. (Applause.) As I bring this matter to this convention on this floor knowing what occurred in the Committee last evening I most heartily second the motion of Mr. Evans of Philadelphia who knows what he is talking about. I think the word "preferentially" should be injected in there, and let the rich man serve without pay if he wants to, but compensate the poor man if he has got to sacrifice his family in so serving. (Applause.)

CAPTAIN ARTHUR F. COSBY (of New York): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, as a member of the Sub-Committee on Universal Military Training and Service, I wish to reply to the remark of the last speaker, that there was no discussion on this matter. I wish to say, as Secretary of that Committee, that our Committee met yesterday morning and debated this resolution which has been presented here on universal military training from half-past ten in the morning until two o'clock. The thing was thrashed out as thoroughly as we could in that time.

Everybody was given a chance to discuss the matter. The members of the Committee were men who had been working on this matter—specialists on this matter in various ways. And the resolution, the final conclusion reached, of recommending that they serve without pay, was the majority opinion. (Applause.)

GEN. DOUGHERTY: You misunderstood my statement entirely.

MR. MENKEN: The gentleman did not refer, Captain Cosby, to the question of military training.

MR. HENRY THEOBALD (of Toledo, Ohio): Mr. Chairman, my remarks seem now to be superfluous since Captain Cosby has spoken. As a member of that Committee, however, I do not remember a dissenting voice in reference to that paragraph.

MR. MENKEN: The entire Committee, as I understood it, stood for the principle.

MR. THEOBALD: It is most unfortunate to inject a discrimination as to citizenship in that service.

MR. MENKEN: Is there any further discussion? The lady on my right has the floor.

MRS. HASSETT (Washington, D. C.): I wish to ask what will happen to the families of those soldiers who were wage-earners, if they serve without pay?

MR. MENKEN: This is to apply to boys preferably at the age of nineteen, and they are not supposed to be married and have very large families at that age. (Laughter.) A motion has been made and duly seconded to lay the amendment on the table.

MR. EVANS: Is a rejoinder from me in order.

MR. MENKEN: Yes, by all means, Mr. Evans. We want to hear all sides of this important question thoroughly presented and thoroughly discussed, with no limitation.

MR. EVANS: I think it would be unfortunate if we began to think here in terms of confusion. The gentleman from Toledo referred to the word "preferential" as though it meant in preference as to who should be paid. That is not the purport of that language in that form. The word "preferential" merely expresses the opinion of this conference, that preferentially, all service should not be paid, but it doesn't rigidly demand it.

MR. THEOBALD: Mr. Chairman, I did not misunderstand the gentleman's remarks. I believe I understand the purport of the remarks.

(The question was called for.)

MR. MENKEN: A motion to lay on the table Mr. Evans' amendment to insert the words "preferentially without pay," and striking out the word "no" is now before you. I will put the vote. All those in favor of laying the motion on the table please say "Aye." Contrary-minded, "No." The motion prevails.

The Chair thinks the ayes have it. If you call for a division, I will be glad to call for it, if you have any question.

MR. EVANS: I won't pursue it further.

MR. MENKEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Evans; I appreciate it. The next clause is on the matter of Military Policy.

DR. BURR: Mr. Chairman, there are five words in Paragraph "A" that it would seem to be desirable to strike out: the words "preferably in the nineteenth year." I believe that for the moral and the mental and the physical hygiene of the boy, the training should begin at fourteen or fifteen. Personally, I believe that. While I wouldn't inject that, I would omit "and preferably in the nineteenth year."

MR. MENKEN: You so move, Dr. Burr?

DR. BURR: I make that motion, yes.

MR. MENKEN: Is it seconded?

A DELEGATE: It is; I second it.

MR. HARVEY (Wilmington): I move that the motion be laid on the table.

(Motion seconded.)

MR. MENKEN: Dr. Burr, the gentleman on my right moves that that amendment be laid on the table.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion to lay it on the table.

MR. MENKEN: Is there any discussion? You have four minutes more.

DR. BURR: I believe that for mental and moral hygiene, the military training to be most effective should be given in that reckless period beginning about the fourteenth year. I think the disciplinary value of it would be vastly greater and that it should begin at that time.

MR. MENKEN: The motion to lay on the table is now before you. It has been moved and seconded that Dr. Burr's motion, which strikes out of Section "A" the words "preferably in the nineteenth year," be laid on the table. All those in favor please say "Aye." Contrary "No." It is a vote.

"Military Policy." Is there any discussion on that? If not, we will pass to the next.

MR. HENRY A. WISE WOOD (of New York): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The saying that the prophet is not without honor save in his own country, was never better illus-

trated than in the cast of our great Mahan. Captain Mahan taught every civilized nation save our own the uses of sea power. A few years ago we were the second naval power. We fell into the position of third naval power, and are rapidly falling to the position of fourth naval power in ships and material and fifth naval power in the number of our officers and men.

I do not think it necessary for me to say anything in these few moments at my disposal upon the necessity of our restoring ourselves to second naval power in the Atlantic.

MR. MENKEN: Mr. Wood, what motion are you speaking to?

MR. WOOD: The navy.

MR. MENKEN: Well, there is no motion.

MR. WOOD: I asked you if I might speak.

First, in the Pacific. I only want to suggest one thought that hasn't yet come either to our government or to the American people, and that is this: The basis in all sea power lies in the ability of a nation to build quickly and in sufficient quantity a defensive fleet—that is, a nation's ability to build a fleet represents the measure of its sea power.

We have looked at the matter of the construction of a fleet from the wrong standpoint. And I would suggest that in the matter of constructing our naval defense, instead of fitting it to our meagre shipbuilding facilities, we reverse our viewpoints and fit our shipbuilding facilities for the naval needs of the nation. (Applause.)

In conclusion, I suggest that we not only must be made the second naval power in the Atlantic and the first in the Pacific, but that means not only sea power, it means air power as well. (Applause.) It means that air power is going to be as effective, perhaps, as sea power in determining the status of nations. So that in suggesting that this be carried, I want to imply that the message calls for an adequate air power in connection with our sea power, the two being one. (Applause.)

MR. MENKEN: I want to say this for your information, that at our great banquet to-night we are going to have the benefit of having Admiral Peary to speak upon the air power. We have Mr. Alan R. Hawley here representing the Aero Club of America, and that we are going to give attention to aeronautics in due course. (Applause.)

MRS. STONE (of Michigan): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have done sociological work in at least five countries of Europe. I have watched the progress since 1908 of the development of efficiency in the European countries, and before we pass on to Military Policy I want to speak in favor of pay to those in training.

(Cries of "You are out of order.")

MR. MENKEN: You are out of order.

MRS. STONE: On the subject of no pay?

MR. MENKEN: It has been ruled and passed and laid on the table.

MRS. STONE: That was "preferential pay." Mine is "pay." (Laughter and applause.)

MR. MENKEN: The Chair rules that the lady is in order. (Laughter and applause.)

MRS. STONE: In the public schools, in the manual training schools of Europe, the children are paid for their time after they come to the age at which they could labor for pay outside. This is done to secure efficiency.

How can we ask young men of nineeen, if they are not married, if they have mothers and sisters and have widowed mothers after this war, how can we ask them to go into our army without pay and take a year's training? I say, No. You will have no efficiency if you compel them.

And if you have compulsory impressment to army service and no pay, you make a mistake. I move we strike out the word "No" (Applause.) in paragraph "A." (Applause.)

MR. MENKEN: We are up to the Navy, and that motion, incidentally, is not seconded.

Now, we are going to the question of Industrial Preparedness, paragraph "F." Is there any discussion on the matter of industrial preparedness? If not, we will go to the next. Governmental Efficiency.

MR. EVANS: I move as an amendment to that resolution, "Governmental Efficiency," that Congress be requested promptly to make a survey of red tape controlling the methods of the army and navy, and having seen the results of it, to promptly reform it. (Loud applause.)

MR. MENKEN: Is Mr. Evans' motion seconded?

(Motion seconded by several members.)

MR. MENKEN: You have heard the motion. Are there any remarks? If not, we will put the amendment. Has the amendment been phrased in writing so that it can be put into the records?

MR. EVANS: It goes in that precise language.

MR. ROBERT M. BOYD of Montclair, N. J.: Mr. Chairman, if that be the precise language, I move that it be laid upon the table, for I think we will accomplish nothing by adopting a resolution in undiplomatic phrase.

MR. MENKEN: Do you mean to imply that you agree with the sentiment and differ with the language?

MR. BOYD: Well, I might agree with the sentiment if I heard it in a little more diplomatic way.

MR. MENKEN: Mr. Evans, will you write it out?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I object to phrasing it in diplomatic language.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman who is most in sympathy with it is the one who should phrase it.

MR. MENKEN: Will you state it over, Mr. Evans, so that we may have it clear?

MR. EVANS: That Congress be requested to make a survey of the red tape under which the army and navy is conducted, and, having seen the result of this work, to promptly reform it.

MR. MENKEN: Strike out the words "having seen the result of."

MR. HARVEY: I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. EVANS: Diplomacy meant everything in 1914; at the present year it means going directly and truthfully to the facts. (Applause.)

MR. MENKEN: You have heard Mr. Evans' motion, that we add his suggestion to the resolution. All those in favor of Mr. Evans' motion please say "Aye."

(Several ayes and cries of "what is the motion?")

MR. MENKEN: The stenographer is instructed to read the motion.

(The motion was read by the stenographer.)

MR. HARVEY: That is the motion that I moved be laid on the table.

MR. MENKEN: It has been moved and seconded that Mr. Evans' motion be laid on the table. All those in favor please say "Aye." Contrary "No." The motion to lay Mr. Evans' motion on the table is carried.

"Americanization and Dual Citizenship." Is there any discussion about that? If not, we will go to the question of International Relations.

MR. HOPKINSON: I want to offer, not an amendment, but a general suggestion as to Americanization. That is —

MR. MENKEN: Will you phrase it as a motion, Mr. Hopkinson, because we want you, at least —

MR. HOPKINSON: I don't want to make a motion. I want to make just a suggestion: That the membership of this organization, nine-tenths of the Committees also, are from the Eastern and Northern States, and that every effort ought to be made to broaden out the membership, in order to bring about the Americanization which is referred to in the resolution. (Applause.)

MR. MENKEN: That matter will receive very prompt attention, of course. One difficulty has been this, that we have to have Committees operating with some degree of cohesion and ability to get together quickly and continuously. Our Committees sometimes meet two and three and four times a week, and of course you could not expect members from remote sections to come together very frequently. But we will try to cure it in spirit.

MR. HOPKINSON: The organization has been going now for how long—two or three years?

MR. MENKEN: Two years.

MR. HOPKINSON: Considering that fact, it seems to me it has an imperfect distribution; it is altogether too limited.

MR. MENKEN: Well, it is not quite as limited as you think it is. I want to say right here that we are proud of the fact that we have a delegate who has come all the way from the city of Los Angeles, and another one from Seattle. (Loud applause.)

I want, before we get through, to have a chance to talk to the delegate from Los Angeles, and we have been looking for the delegate from Seattle, because we want to do something to him, too.

MR. ELLSWORTH BENHAM, of Portland, Oregon: I am not from Seattle, I am from Portland. I do not belong to Seattle. (Laughter.)

MR. MENKEN: I want to say that we are glad to have Portland here, but Seattle is represented too. We have got you both.

Now, the Chair will entertain the motion—I think it was of Colonel Jewett's, or General Jewett.

COLONEL JEWETT: Both of them.

MR. MENKEN: That was because you volunteered.

COLONEL JEWETT: Well, I move, sir, that the report of the Committee on Resolutions as printed be adopted.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. J. J. McCOOK, of Hartford, Conn.: Mr. Chairman, I have at heart the interest of this Congress and an appreciation of its proper plans—and its plans are proper. On that very account I regret deeply to see, as I think I do see, a possibility of the plans being embarrassed because of a very small part of the report.

I move you, sir, that section "D," the fragment of a line on the second page, under the sub-title "Universal Military Training," which says "No pay be given men when being trained," be dropped. We have seen already a considerable amount of feeling in regard to it. We are not unanimous in respect to it, and it seems to me we are pretty unanimous in regard to everything else. I am as sensitive as anyone can be in regard to this matter of working without pay in the army or elsewhere. If any one has done more without pay than I, I should like to become acquainted with him. (Laughter.) I believe it is a great thing, and I believe that everything that tends to promote a thoroughly democratic touch of elbow with elbow should be sought for and stuck to. I do not think it is at all necessary that we should make this one of our plans.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. MENKEN: Mr. McCook, we will put the motion. The Committee is entirely agreeable that it should be put, and I will ask Col. Jewett to yield for a moment, while we are putting the motion.

COLONEL JEWETT: Yes; my only object in making the motion was to stop debate.

MR. MENKEN: It is all right, but we want to get a result here that will send us all out singing with joy and accomplishment.

MR. HOLLAND of Chicago: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say this: Although this is perhaps the storm centre of the Union Labor situation of the United States, it would be a mistake to leave this clause in this report. It is quite unnecessary. Congress is going to decide this question one way or the other. The vital thing that we are here for is to do what we can to promote a knowledge throughout the country of what the danger to the country is, (Cries of "hear!" hear!" and applause.) and to promote plans for the proper defense of the country at all times.

We should make a mistake, we should misconceive our own strength as an organization, misconceive our own prestige, which remains yet to be established in this country, if we commit ourselves unnecessarily to details that are not essential to the main program. (Loud applause.)

MR. MENKEN: I understand that Mr. Holland seconds Mr. McCook's resolution.

MR. ROBERT M. BOYD of Montclair, N. J.: Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with Mr. Holland for the reason that whatever we do here, we should determine, not by a mere majority vote but we should determine it by concensus of opinion, practically unanimous, and unless we are practically unanimous on that point, it should be dropped. (Applause.)

MR. MENKEN: Well, now we will put the question. All those in favor of eliminating the clause which reads that no pay shall be given men when being trained, please say "Aye." Contrary minded, "No." It is a vote. (Applause.)

MR. HOLLAND: Mr. Chairman, may I have the attention of the Chair just one moment, and the Congress, to point out one inconsistency of this report which should be removed? Have I your permission?

MR. MENKEN: You have.

MR. HOLLAND: Under the heading "The Navy," the Congress very properly, in my judgment, "recommends to the National Congress that in carrying this into effect it adopt the judgment of our naval authorities." Quite by oversight, I am sure, and not by design, the immediately preceding clause regarding the land forces, lacks such a provision.

The one recommendation which we can with propriety make to the Congress of the United States, and with certainty that we are not overstepping the bounds of the privilege of a voluntary organization along the line of the motion which Mr. Evans made, and which I voted against, because I did not like the language of it—the one recommendation that we can make and should make is that in considering what is necessary by way of a plan for our National defense by land forces, the recommendations of our General Staff be adopted by the Congress of the United States. (Loud applause.)

I therefore move that we amend that paragraph to read "That we recommend to the National Congress to adopt the plans and recommendations proposed, or that shall be proposed, by the General Staff of the army."

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. MENKEN: The Committee on Resolutions will accept the same language as to the military policy as to the army as they have put in here as to The Navy. Does that cover your suggestion?

MR. HOLLAND: Certainly.

MR. MENKEN: Being accepted, there is no necessity to put the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, as you have been liberal enough to permit a temporary reversal as to another question that came up here and that was voted down, I crave your indulgence for another moment with respect to this matter of Governmental Efficiency.

I desire now, if it is appropriate, to offer this resolution:

> "RESOLVED, That the Committee on Resolutions be requested, in grave and courteous terms, to call the attention of the Government to complexities in their control of army and navy forces in the field, and that they be asked to correct them."

And I want to speak for just one moment as to my reason for this insistence. If there is one tale that has come back from the Mexican Border, which is clear and upon which there is a unit of evidence, it is that the red tape there is unbelievable in its complexity, in its uselessness and lack of necessity; that it has unbelievable potentialities for disaster in real war. It affects everything we do, from getting troops together, sending them there, caring for them and using them on the ground. I heard

the statement made at a dinner, with several hundred gentlemen in Philadelphia the other night, by a high officer in the Navy, that in two recent scraps, or one, I forget which, he had to throw the red tape overboard before he could get in motion and save his ship.

I think it is time, with this sort of evidence from guardsmen and from travelers and every other source, proving that we are tying ourselves up with this sort of thing unnecessarily, that we get down to business on this item, too, and clean house about our actual active management. (Applause.)

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. MENKEN: The Chair would like to say that it has great reverence for Mr. Evans' opinion. We know the measure of services and thought given to this subject, but we have a resolution here which refers to a proper military policy. A policy founded upon red tape can never be a proper one. (Applause.)

I believe your motion is not seconded.

MR. HOLLAND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I second it.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that Mr. Evans' resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. MENKEN: It has been moved and seconded that Mr. Evans' resolution be laid on the table. All in favor will signify by saying "Aye." (Cries of "ayes" and "noes.")

I am in doubt. All those in favor please say "Aye." Contrary minded, "No." (Cries of "ayes" and "noes," and laughter.)

MR. EVANS: I call for a division, Mr. President.

MR. MENKEN: Yes, I think we have to have a division; it is the only kind of division we have.

MR. HOLLAND: Let it be understood what we are voting on. The motion is to lay on the table.

MR. MENKEN: The motion is to lay on the table Mr. Evans' suggestion relative to the elimination of red tape in the army. All those in favor of laying that motion on the table will please raise their hand. All those opposed to laying on the table please raise their hand. The motion to lay on the table is carried.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana, General Jewett—

COLONEL JEWETT: I move that the report as amended be adopted as a whole.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. MENKEN: All those in favor of the adoption of the report as a whole, will signify by saying "Aye." Contrary minded "No." The motion is unanimously carried. (Loud applause.)

Now, just one word. We are going out to do this work and we are going to try to do it well. I want to express the hope, that each and every member of the Congress will feel that he or she is a centre of influence to carry forth the principles that have been enunciated in this meeting. I thank you. (Applause.)

MR. WOOD: I want to propose a rising vote of thanks to the Chairman of this Committee. (Applause.)

The motion was carried by a rising vote of the Congress.

The session then adjourned.

BANQUET

Held at the New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.
January 27, 1917

Mr. Robert Bacon, president of the National Security League, presiding.

MR. BACON: I propose the health of the President of the United States.

(The toast was drunk standing.)

MR. BACON: Ladies and Gentlemen, Delegates and friends, it is a great pleasure to welcome you all here to this splendid convocation. I wish to thank, first of all, all the bodies, the sympathetic organizations which have been good enough to send delegates here, especially from the far away places. I wish especially to extend a word of greeting to the organizations that are working for the same cause that we are working for, as sister organizations, the Navy League, the pioneer; the Army League, the Aero Club, the Conference Committee, the American Defense Society, the American Rights League, the Association for Universal Service, the Americanization Committee, the Women's Section of our Body, (Applause) the Engineers and Chambers of Commerce, the American Legion, the Plattsburg Camp (Applause), and last and youngest, the Universal Military Training League. (Loud applause.)

On behalf of the National Security League, I pledge to them our hearty co-operation, and I hope we shall succeed in obtaining a larger and better measure of co-ordination, and to eliminate a certain amount of duplication, much of which, however, is inevitable. To all of them I pledge the hearty moral support of the National Security League. (Applause.)

The key-note of this great Congress has been sounded loud and clear. It has resounded through every section of the last three days. The touch-stone of our cause is the spirit of sacrifice for the Nation and of National service. (Applause.) Not alone military service, although that must be universal and

obligatory, but service of all kinds, by every man, woman and child, in time of peace as well as in time of war or threatened emergency. And that sort of service we must have if the Nation is going to endure, if we are going to be integrated into a real Nation and take our place, remember, take our place, the proud place to which we are entitled, in the society of Nations. (Applause.)

I am tempted to take an unfair advantage and make a speech. (Laughter and applause.) But I will not. The distinguished speakers who will address you to-night are unwilling to speak each for more than twenty minutes. (Laughter and applause.) We have compromised and agreed on that.

That reminds me of a story I have been told of President Hadley of Yale, who, when asked by an eminent Divine who was visiting New Haven, how long he might preach, replied, "Preach as long as you like; but there will be no conversions after twenty minutes." (Laughter.)

First of all, among our Senators to appreciate the importance and the necessity of universal military service for the Nation, and with the courage of this conviction to introduce a bill, which is the longest step that has been taken, is our distinguished Senator from Oregon. I take great pleasure in presenting Senator Chamberlain. (Loud applause and cheers.)

ADDRESS

Hon. George E. Chamberlain of Oregon, Chairman Senate Committee on Military Affairs

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen: I assure you it is a very great pleasure to be permitted to be with you to-night, however difficult it may be for me to undertake to make a speech after the eloquent addresses you have heard during the past few days. We of us who have been attempting for two or three years to do some constructive work along the lines of national preparedness and defense need, I assure you, the encouragement which this splendid gathering evidences here this evening. Please remember, ladies and gentlemen, that I am limited to ten minutes by your distinguished toastmaster (laughter), and without indulging in any of the flowers of rhetoric that you

are accustomed to hear on an occasion of this kind, I am going to get right down to business and undertake to complete my task in the allotted time. (Applause.)

When I was called to service upon the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States, I felt that it was my duty to find out, if possible, something about the military history as well as the military needs of our country, and I soon found out that much of what we learned in that regard in the school histories of our younger days and in the present, if you please, was not in its entirety true. A recurrence to the actual history of our country during all of its existence convinced me, and would convince any one who will give it the slightest attention, that we have never had what this magnificent republic of ours has needed in the way of military preparedness.

I have sometimes wondered how General Washington, that magnificent leader of men, ever found time during the Revolution to train his men or to get together the necessary volunteers to fight the war to a successful issue, because it has seemed to me that most of his time was consumed with his able aid, Alexander Hamilton, in addressing communications to the Continental Congress, begging them in the name of God to assist him in organizing and maintaining troops in the field. The first part of the war was a succession of defeats. And I read a letter from him only a few days ago, a most pathetic one, to the President of the Continental Congress of the United States, claiming that the death of the gallant Montgomery and the failure to take Quebec was due entirely to the fact that this gallant officer was in command of a body of troops who were to be discharged from their enlistment in the course of a day or two. He either had to fight before he was ready or retreat because of expiring enlistments. It not only cost us the life of this splendid officer, but it cost us a great strategic position and possibly the whole of Canada.

Not only that, in every army since, during the years of 1812 and '45 and '61 and '98, if you please, the gallant officers of our country found the same difficulty—the lack of an efficient military system.

I haven't time to go into details but I would love, if time but afforded, to recite some of the actual facts of our military history and not the history as we find it in the school books that our

children are compelled to study. (Applause.) Looking back upon this history I felt that we were in a hopeless state of unpreparedness through lack of organization and a trained citizenry. It was impossible to secure recruits for the regular army in our recent boundary mobilization, or in the National Guard of the several States. Taking that view of it, and immediately before the beginning of the war in Europe, I began the work of attempting to prepare a universal military training bill that would make the American people realize that they owed some obligations to our country for the benefits which they received from it as citizens. (Applause.)

Why should any particular part of the young men of our country be sent to the Mexican border or anywhere else? While they are patriotically doing duty to their country the slacker and the coward remain at home to take the positions of the young men who have gone to the border. (Cries of "hear!" "hear!" and applause.)

Early in the session in 1915 this measure was introduced in the Congress. I had no assistance at first from anybody except a very few of the officers of the army and a few civilians. None of the newspapers or magazines came to my assistance for some time. Nor did I have the support of the Administration, but thank God the American people are waking up to the needs of this country in a military way, and this splendid gathering is an evidence of the change that has taken place in public sentiment all over the land. (Applause.)

But you ask, Why should we have any reorganization of the Army? Immediately after the Civil War in 1876 a distinguished commission composed of officers of that war was appointed to investigate and report upon the subject. Generals who fought gallantly on the Union side were members of this commission, with General Sherman at the head. Again in '78 another body of distinguished Union generals was appointed as a commission to make another report as to our military needs. And again in 1887 another distinguished body of men composed of generals of the Civil War, and again in 1908 the General Staff of the Army, made reports calling the attention of the people to the needs of this Government. Again, 1912, and again in 1915, and every one of these reports, ladies and gentlemen, except the last that was made by the General Staff of the Army, was pigeon-holed by

the Congress of the United States. (Applause.) Can you blame the American people that they don't understand that they are standing upon the brink of a volcano that is liable to explode at any moment and destroy our country and our civilization and our people?

The recommendations of the General Staff in 1915 were practically engrafted into the reorganization act known as the National Defense Act of June 3rd, 1916. So far as the Regular Army is concerned it is good. But one recommendation of the Senate failed of enactment, and that was a provision which provided for the organization of a volunteer force under the control of the Federal authority instead of under the control of the State as the second line of defense. The result was that while we have a splendid organization of the Federal army, we have as a second line of defense the National Guard, which has proven disappointing as a system in the late mobilization to the Mexican border. (Applause.)

Nobody questions the gallantry, the patriotism and the splendid courage of the individuals composing the National Guard. They are the flower of our youth. (Applause.) They gallantly hastened to answer the call of the President, leaving their families, their homes and their occupations to go to the front, while those who should have been compelled to serve remained behind and took the positions of those who answered their country's call. It was not their fault that the mobilization of the National Guard was disappointing, ladies and gentlemen. It was the fault of the system; and no system can be a success in this country that is not under the control of the Federal Government itself. (Applause.)

Now, I have not time to discuss and to point out the defects in our military system. It would take too long. The most essential step toward national preparedness is a trained citizenry from which an army may be recruited in time of emergency, and that can be accomplished by universal compulsory military training. (Loud applause.)

Do not deceive yourselves by thinking that the task is an easy one. For over a month I have sat from ten o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the evening listening to those who favored and those who opposed the system, and you would have been astounded if you could have listened to these hearings and have

heard the arguments against anything like preparing our country for trouble either at home or abroad. It is a work of education. Upon you devolves this patriotic but difficult task. Go out from here, ladies and gentlemen, telling the story of our needs to your own home people, and see to it that it is told in every school house and upon every rostrum in our broad land. (Applause.)

I wish I could talk to you longer and call attention to some of the troubles, not only at home, but some of the troubles that threaten us abroad. We are mealy-mouthed about these things. When I dare talk about them I am called a jingoist. But everybody that stops to think will realize and will know that predatory nations travel in packs and herds, and we know further than that, that some of the predatory nations across the waters are already banding themselves together in treaties of alliance, offensive and defensive and what their purpose may be God only knows! We will not know ladies and gentlemen, until the clash of arms comes and we find ourselves unprepared to meet the difficulties that will then confront us. Let us then go to work.

But my time is up. (Cries of "Go ahead! Go on!") I have a friend here just loaded with a good speech, and I am not going to take any of his time. (Laughter.) But let me beg you, ladies and gentlemen, let me beg of you, to remember that we are not isolated any more. There was a time when our isolation protected us, and the best friends America had were the two oceans to the east and to the west of us. That day is past. A mobilization of troops from any foreign country can be made on the shores of America to-day easier and quicker and at less expense than it was possible to mobilize an army and get it from Washington to Appomattox during the time of the Civil War.

Let us remember that we are now sitting at the council board of the Nations, the powers of the earth, and if we expect to have our voices heard, and if we expect to have our demands and our desires respected we can only do it by having such a force as may be necessary to compel obedience to the just demands and just requirements of the American people. (Applause.)

There is one partial remedy in sight, and that is by compelling the citizens of our land between the ages of nineteen and forty-five to prepare themselves, if need be, to answer their country's call, when that call happens to be made. (Loud applause.)

MR. BACON: Yes, Senator Chamberlain, there has been an awakening, but we have a long way to go. I want to say that for National Security League is calling the Nation—paraphrasing Lord Roberts, who, in the year before he died, sent his clarion call out to the English Nation—"Wake up, America; the hour is at hand!"

One of the first to recognize the coming reawakening, and, with clear vision, to coin a phrase which seems particularly happy, "the renaissance of patriotism," was the distinguished Senator from the middle west, proprietor of a great paper, whose work has been splendid for the cause, a man who for several years now has been much abroad in contact with the world to sharpen that vision without which the Good Book says the people perish, and has come home to us with a message of added information and strength.

I take great pleasure in presenting to you Senator Lafayette Young of Des Moines, Iowa.

ADDRESS

Lafayette Young of Des Moines, Iowa, former United States Senator from Iowa

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen: I do not appear here to-night as a hero of any war, although my venerable appearance might indicate that I was in the Civil War, but that is not true. If I had been, it would not have lasted so long. (Laughter.) I was not in the Confederate Army; I was not in the Federal Army; I have never been in the British Army, I have never been in the army of Russia or Japan or Denmark, nor with Sweden or Italy, and Heaven knows I have never been in the army of Turkey (laughter) and I have nothing to do with those countries or with the principles of military countries.

I do not appear to-night as representing any of these elements. I appear as an American citizen (applause) solely and alone. (Laughter.) We used to have in the humble homes of the Mississippi Valley the motto worked in cardboard with red and blue yarn, "God Bless Our Home." (Laughter.) It was very popular. It always stood by the kerosene lamp on a red mat. (Laughter.) That has now been amended to read, "God Bless Every-

body's Home Except Ours." (Laughter and applause.) If I ever die as a hero, it is going to be for the U. S. A., nobody else. (Applause.)

I want to tell you my great surprise. I am not a lawyer, a doctor or a preacher, but I have been honored by being made one of the instructors in the school of patriotism. I was twelve years old when the Civil War sounded its drums and fifes, and in the enthusiasm of that hour I never could have dreamed that there ever would be the necessity for a school of patriotism in the United States of America. (Applause.)

As a boy, in the Spring of '62, I went across the ploughed fields at night to a lonely light where a mother sat by the window waiting for the news from Shiloh for the dead and wounded. I carried to that home a letter with a black border around it saying, by the Captain of the Company, "Your boy died on the bank of the Tennessee," and she said, "Did he die with his face to the foe?" And he did. That woman prayed and did not weep. In that hour I could not have foreseen that it would ever be necessary to say, "patriotism," in a land so free, among men so brave, and in opportunity so conspicuous.

Yet to-night and to-day and for several days we have had no creed but patriotism and no tune except the patriotic airs. To-night, my friends, I want to ask you in behalf of this splendid organization, to read the card that lies before you asking for a small contribution to this great cause and its publications. I do that as a simple duty. You know we used to have an old banner which said, "Give me liberty or give me death." What has become of it? Is it supplanted by another: "Go 'way and don't disturb me or I'll vote for the other ticket." (Applause.)

I am glad this photographer made a great noise awhile ago. In God's name, we need noise all over the United States! I asked a woman on the streets of London why the Suffragettes were so busy blowing up things over there. A woman, a pink-cheeked English girl, said, "Nothing but dynamite will wake an Englishman up." (Laughter.) And I have concluded that we need some of the same brand of dynamite in the United States to wake our people up.

I don't talk about the Mississipi Valley being dead in patriotism. I find about the same proportion wherever I go, of dead-

ness. (Applause.) The trouble is that you are all too rich. A man out where I live says, "A fat dog will not hunt." (Laughter.)

I never knew until I was abroad so much that we had not a friend on earth outside of the United States. I was five months with the armies in Europe. I went on the Lusitania, next to her last sailing before she went down. I know something about this business from the other side. I went on the Lusitania the time she raised the American flag off the Irish Coast, when the sea was so rough that I thought she would never come back from one side to the other. A rumor went around the ship that they had raised the American flag, and when I landed in Liverpool and in London, I found for the first time in my life that I was famous. I had been on a ship that had raised the American flag. (Laughter and applause.)

They gathered around me, and discussed the logic and propriety of the British raising the American flag. I said I did not know whether it was legal or not, but I knew it was the best flag the British ever raised. (Applause.)

I was in Berlin when they sunk the Lusitania. I passed the door of the American Embassy with the Ambassador and his wife, and it is not to our shame to say that we wept, feeling for America. He told me in language only a Democrat could use, "Get out of the country, we will have war with Germany." And they sent me out on a special train and sent me into the interior to a soup house, and I was never heard of afterwards. (Laughter.)

If this country had had 300,000 or 400,000 well-drilled, armed and equipped men, no power would have sunk the Lusitania. (Loud applause.) Germany knew whose face to spit in. (Laughter.)

For the first twenty-five years of this republic, every danger was from abroad. From the laying of the corner-stone of the Bunker Hill monument until the firing on Sumter, we had no trouble except our own troubles. After the war we had the inspiring patriotism of the surviving soldiers, with their manhood and vigor to rebuild the North and South, and we had patriotism at every fireside. (Applause.) They did not need my services as an instructor.

In the South you had Stonewall Jackson, whose campaign furnished the only text-book quoted from in the United States and Europe. An officer being made ready for his job told me that he had Stonewall Jackson for breakfast, at dinner and supper. (Laughter and applause.) Until these old veterans began to totter and die, you did not need a Security League; you had patriotism at every fireside. In '98 you had two men enlisting for one that you wanted; now you can't get anybody to fight. (Laughter.)

My twenty minutes have been marked down to eighteen. I want to tell you men and women that I was with the Shafter Expedition; did you ever hear of that? (Laughter.) God was merciful to us that time. (Laughter.) A good northern zephyr would have swept us all to the bottom.

I had a great experience. I had not been away from home much. I had been in the fields on the farms, I had been at my usual occupation, but I went with that expedition, and I tell you what attracted my attention: I inquired of a seafaring man as well as I could without exposing my ignorance, "What time are we going to pass San Salvador?" (Laughter.) He said, "Nuthin' there." I said, "I don't care. There is where we started. There is where Columbus raised the cross and the flag of Spain. There was our beginning." And on that night on the Gulf, with the phosphorous bringing the lights up out of the waves, rivaling the Milky Way, I looked and peered through the dark as the sailor said, "Yonder, that dark outline, is San Salvador."

Ah, the history that had rolled between that fateful day in 1492 and the day when we were going for the first time to invade a foreign land under the American flag! I had inspirations that night that will do me good as a teacher of patriotism so long as life endures. And when we landed through the waves at Dalquira and marched on Santiago, oh, if Spain had understood her business! (Laughter.) Then our American public would have been holding memorial services for every one of us. (Laughter.) We all are survivors through the weakness of the enemy.

In fact, men, there is no land except this reserved in the womb of time to start a new civilization away from the meannesses and indecencies and wrongs and crimes of four thousand years

in other lands. There is no land like this, my friends, no matter how you shape it or what you do with it, and God has been with us from the start. (Applause.) Let me tell you that the American Army and Navy never fired a shot that did not hit an object higher than the one aimed at. (Applause.)

If I have one remaining minute of the twenty, I want to tell you that if there is one man in the world that I want to hate—and I have applied to my spiritual advisor for permission (laughter)—if I can do it without endangering my immortal soul, I am going to hate him. (Laughter.) That is the man who has grown rich in the United States of America, upon our soil, profiting by your business and mine, and goes back to his old country to spend his days in leisure. (Cries of "Good!" "Good!" and applause.)

A naturalized American, when called upon in his old country for any help or duty, says, "I'm an American," and waves his naturalization papers. The only time he likes them is when they can save him money or duty. That is the men who, after it is all over and he has escaped his duty, to square himself with his neighbors, lies on everybody who is in America, from the President down, to show that he is just as good an American as he ever was. That is the man I want to hate. There never was a steer large enough to grow a hide big enough to make a shoe or boot large enough to fit a foot big enough to kick him far enough! (Loud laughter and applause.) I would have a Committee at Ellis Island saying to every man, woman and child, "If you are free from disease, come into the United States." But I would say, "You have got to stay here six months and take a bath and shave and learn the English language before we can let you loose." (Laughter and applause.)

We complain of the foreigner, and he has a right to complain of us. He is told before he comes that he can pick up gold—twenty dollar gold pieces on the streets of New York, (laughter) by the steamship companies that wanted $19 for bringing him over in the hold. He comes over and he finds it all false. There is a shorter and uglier word that fits it better. He finds that he has been betrayed and he is turned away from Ellis Island with a few dollars in his pocket. He is picked up by a contractor, somebody who speaks his own language, he is run into all kinds of vice and meanness, he is robbed, and finally finds himself on

a railroad right of way, out in New Mexico or somewhere, holding down a job on a section and living in a vile box-car. Do you suppose you can make an American citizen out of him, men and women? Do you suppose you can give him the ballot?

The foreigners say they have got to have the ballot and they must get it by wireless or get it in a hurry. So your destiny and mine is in the hands, in many respects, of ignorance and inexperience and men that are unfit.

I will tell you, my friends, I am opposed to swift naturalization. (Applause.) I want no man naturalized until he can read and write the English language. (Applause.) Germany knows her business. She makes every man, woman or child in any colony she has, speak the German language. More than that. I never would allow a man who would go from this country to serve under a foreign flag in this war, whether it is Italy, France, Great Britain or any other country, I would never allow him to come back to the United States at all. (Applause.) Why? Because after he has renewed his allegiance in blood under his own flag, he will never be good for anything for us as a citizen. (Cries of "No," and applause.)

No, never. If he is going, tell him "Good-bye, bury yourself over there; we don't want you."

But I tell you, men, we owe a duty to the foreigner. We haven't done our duty. We ought to educate him so that he comes out to Nebraska and Minnesota and works on a farm instead of staying in New York and other cities. Teach him the English language for his own good, for our good. Oppose cashiers of banks speaking foreign languages, to encourage a man never to learn the language of this country. The Postal Savings Bank was gotten up to enable a man to do business without learning a word of the language. That is a harmful thing. Let them learn the language. Let them blend with us as soon as possible in all respects, and you will have good citizens. You are at the mercy of people who do not know, who cannot understand a republic. They come from a Government that they hate. They hear a demagogue make a speech over here and they conclude they'd better hate this Government too.

I tell you, my friends, I have but one banner, and for the United States of America against all comers, even when the

Democrats are in power. (Laughter and applause.) And that is going some.

I don't care whether the President is a Democrat or not, he is our President. (Cheering and applause.) He represents my country. The demand of the hour is for men, patriotic men.

No patriot ever steals public funds; it is a time-serving grafter that does it. The Civil War veterans in the North and in the South never stole public money, because they were patriots. Now, my friends, in this great, free land, with her sweeping prairies and mountains and her opportunities, let us educate our children at home and quit sending our professors abroad to be Europeanized and bringing professors back to Europeanize our people over here. They get us going and coming. Ninety per cent. of all the exchange professors coming from other lands to this are enemies of the United States, and all their teaching is nefarious. (Cries of "No.") You are not up to my platform yet, but you will get there after a while. (Applause.)

I will tell you where I took the oath to do these things. After I had seen the aeroplanes and the Zeppelins and the floating mines and the hundreds and thousands of dead and wounded, after I had looked upon a grave outside of Paris, with 20,000 bodies buried there, gathered from the field of the Marne, one-half German and the other French—they had been buried in quicklime to save the water supply and not to disturb the waters of the Marne that flowed into the Seine—I have looked upon that—after I had come through Belgium and seen its ruins, had seen the Catholic churches with their solemn priests and with women and children in black kneeling and praying to God for the boys in the trenches; after I had visited the old Cathedral down at Orleans, where Joan of Arc made her great career; after I had seen the women in black in the fields of Austria, holding the plough handles while a ten-year old boy held the lines, ploughing in the field, stopping between times to go to the Crucified One, the out-door shrine, and kneeling there in the open, praying to God for the boys in the trenches; after I had seen that and all the hospital horrors after five months in the trenches, then under shell fire from all parts of the Somme, I finally got back, by the Ambassador's advice, to dear old Holland. I wanted indeed to hear the dogs bark in Holland.

The ships were not going, so I went up to Leyden to spend the time. There is a little church at Leyden, with 126 names on a scroll of those that had sailed in the Mayflower from Plymouth, England. There, uncovered, in a strange land, I took an oath that if I was spared to get back to the United States, my life and strength should be dedicated to making an appreciation among Americans of their own liberty, of their own opportunities, of their own life, and of their own country, so that they wouldn't let a foreigner tell them that "the Star Spangled Banner" was not music, and they musn't play it, and "America" was not music, and they must not play it. We have been buffaloed by Europe in every way at times, and we have got to quit it and have a land of our own homes, our own hopes. And now, my friends, good night. (Loud applause.)

MR. BACON: A year ago, at a memorable meeting, when the future was not so clear even as it is now, the National Security League, after careful consideration and deliberation, passed, as the first article of its faith, a declaration for universal military training and service. That was a year ago. One of the distinguished statesmen who spoke to us that night is here to-night to testify to the advancement and the progress that has come since then.

I take great pleasure in introducing former Attorney-General Wickersham. (Applause.)

PATRIOTISM

Address by George W. Wickersham of New York, former Attorney-General of the United States

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen: This Congress, the meetings we have holding, the speeches we have been hearing during the past three days, all have had for their avowed object the quickening of our sense of patriotism, our love of country, and the formulation of constructive programs to justify that love of country.

The historian Lecky says:

> "All civic virtues, all the heroism and self-sacrifice of patriotism, spring ultimately from the habit men acquire of regarding their nation as a great organic whole, identifying themselves with its fortunes in the past as in the present and looking forward anxiously to its future destinies."

Unity of feeling, growing out of common traditions and a community of inherited pride in the ideals and accomplishments of our country, therefore, lies at the root of patriotism. If one cannot be proud of his country's history, it were difficult to dedicate himself to its service. For true patriotism necessarily implies a readiness to sacrifice oneself for the common good. Bacon ranked among the greatest of honors that which in his time he said, "happeneth rarely, that is, of such as sacrifice themselves to death or danger, for the good of their country. As was M. Regulus, and the two Decii." This honorable spirit of sacrificial devotion to country is strongest where it grows out of a common tradition, which furnishes the most powerful basis of patriotic impulse. In our National anthem, we hold up to love and reverence the image of the "Land of the Pilgrim's pride, Land where our Fathers died;" and in that pathetic last appeal which President Lincoln made to the rebellious spirit of the Southern States in 1861, it was to this instinct of pride in the past to which he appealed when he said:

> "The mystic chords of memory stretching from every battle-field and patriot grave to every living hearth and hearth-stone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

How can we better quicken a sense of patriotism among our people to-day than to recall the ideals of the past; what it was that made this the land of the Pilgrim's pride; what it is that makes our institutions of government better than those of any other peoples; how our liberties and our prosperity which we enjoy in such abundance were won and maintained, and to what efforts we must devote ourselves if we desire to perpetuate them for ourselves and our children and our children's children.

And first let us never forget that all that we have and enjoy was won by self-sacrifice and self-abandonment. It was won and held by men who had the courage of their convictions and who maintained them at the cost of ease and comfort and even life itself.

> "We sit here in the Promised Land
> That flows with Freedom's honey and milk;
> But 'twas they won it, sword in hand,
> Making the nettle danger soft for us as silk."

Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Maryland notably among the other states, were settled by men and women who sought there freedom to worship God in their own way, and while among the Puritans tolerance of others was lacking, the Quakers of Pennsylvania and the Roman Catholics of Maryland afford a more generous example of a willingness to share with others a privilege claimed for themselves. In course of time, Massachusetts also yielded to more generous and tolerant views, and the short-sighted treatment of her colonies by Great Britain united them all by that most potent bond of union, a sense of common injury. So, the revolution developed thirteen separate and loosely connected colonies into "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the principle that all men are created equal."

This great national ideal, that men are born free, born with certain inalienable rights, not dependent upon kings, constitutions, or statutes, but birthrights, "to secure which governments are instituted among men," is the great distinctive feature, the great transforming thought in the development of human civilization, which gives to the history of our country its most glorious tradition and its most inspiring ideal. But the men who assembled at Philadelphia to put that thought into language were not deluded into the belief that their words would be self-operative. They knew that their value lay in the inspiration they would furnish to the people to enforce them by force of arms. They knew that, as to Liberty,

> "Those love her best who to themselves are true,
> And what they dare to dream of dare to do."

So throughout that long seven years struggle of the War of Revolution, though defeat and doubt and privation were far more common than victory, in the end the cause of America triumphed, because Washington and his associates inspired the people so that what they dared to dream of, they dared to do.

But national patriotism must be based on national unity. Pride in one's native city, after the fall of the Roman Empire, was in large measure the boundary of patriotic spirit. Dante has left us an immortal picture of the shade of a citizen of Mantua, who at the mere sound of its name upon the lips of Virgil, was moved to joy even amid the sombre shadows of Purgatory. And the Florentine poet burst into bitter words over the contrast

between this love of city, this fraternal love awakened between the two shades by the sweet sound of their city's name, and the discord and dissension which prevailed throughout Italy, which made of it a "hostel of grief and ship without pilot in great tempest."

The need of a more perfect union of the American States, in order that the new nation might the better accomplish the great ideal of liberty which gave it birth, led to the framing and adoption of that constitution of government under which we have since 1787 lived and mightily prospered, and which has been indeed the very ark of the national covenant to those who have inherited the traditions of regulated liberty upon which it was founded.

The government thus established survived the reaction from the high inspiration of actual danger; the humiliating second war with England with its demonstration of the consequence of neglect of national preparation, the weakness of reliance upon the state militia under the dual control unhappily perpetuated in the Constitution and the inevitable result of an administration of the national government which disregarded warnings, neglected precautions and persisted in regarding peace as in itself an object for which all else should be sacrificed. Our school histories have glossed over this period, and have held between it and our people our few inspiring victories on land and sea, which have served to obscure the contemptible role which the government and the military forces of the United States so frequently played throughout the two years duration of the war. Events of greater importance in Europe; the downfall of the Empire of Napoleon, the readjustment of European institutions and nationalities, obscured the American question to European thought and left us in great measure ignored by it until 1823, when once more an opportunity was presented and availed of to make the United States the moral leader of the world, by the assertion of a new and vital principle of national consciousness.

On December 2, 1823, President Monroe informed the Congress that,

> "the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth

not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power," he continued, "we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

The United States was but a small nation when the Monroe Doctrine thus was formulated and announced as its national policy, yet the world accepted it, not as a mere academic declaration, but as a militant statement of national purpose which would be maintained with the power of the Union. Years later, President Cleveland gave to it a renewed effect, by intervening between Great Britain and Venezuela, and when the former refused to submit to arbitration a long pending dispute over a strip of territory claimed by Venezuela, affirmed that the matter involved the vital interests of the United States and its right by virtue of the Monroe Doctrine to itself investigate the quesion, and if as a result thereof, the title should be found to be in Venezuela,

"to resist by every means in its power, as a wilful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory, which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela."

Neither Great Britain nor any other power had any doubt that the President who penned those lines meant exactly the import of his words; the country responded, as it always has responded, to virile leadership; Congress authorized and the President appointed a commission of inquiry, whose labors were brought to an early termination by the making of a treaty between Great Britain and Venezuela which provided a basis for the peaceful settlement of the differences between those powers.

While not directly invoked in its justification, the Monroe Doctrine actually was applied when, at the instance of President McKinley, Congress authorized the Executive to intervene in Cuba to terminate the armed efforts of the Spanish military

forces to suppress the insurrection, and to secure in that unhappy island a stable government capable of maintaining order and of preserving international obligations.

We did not hesitate to occupy that island with the United States Army and Navy, to expel the Spanish forces, and then after having established a Cuban government apparently strong enough to maintain order and secure the liberty of the Cuban people, to comply with the declaration made by Congress in its joint resolution of April 20, 1898, that it was not the intention of the United States to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over the island "except for the pacification thereof," by withdrawing therefrom. A few years later, when the political unrest of the island threatened the overthrow of all stable government, we again intervened with our military forces, restored order and secured a peaceful reorganization of the Cuban government. On these two occasions, we exhibited that which alone commands the respect of other nations in international controversies, that is, a readiness to employ force when necessary to the preservation of order in communities for which we have assumed responsibility by intervening in their internal affairs, and the protection of our national interests. We had taken a step which emphasized our moral leadership in the world when we bade the monarchies of Europe keep hands off the struggling republics of the Americas. We demonstrated the value of our policy when we not only disclaimed any intention to acquire sovereignty over Cuba while ousting from it the sovereignty of Spain, and when having established a government by the people of that island, we withdrew to allow them to demonstrate their ability to continue in the same. We completed the lesson when a second time we recognized our responsibility to the Cuban people and the civilized world by intervening with force of arms when the Cuban government broke down and the forces of disorder threatened to destroy the work we had achieved, reestablishing a stable government, and again withdrawing.

The maintenance of the Union of the States—that "more perfect Union," which the Constitution was framed to secure, was long threatened by a question which Mr. Seward fitly termed "the irrepressible conflict." Truly, as Mr. Lincoln declared, the nation could not endure half slave and half free, and when successive compromises had proved to be no solution, the issue

between State and National sovereignty became the expression of a conflict between human slavery and human freedom which must be fought out until one was finally conquered by the other.

Surely, no one looking back over the history of that struggle can regret that it was fought to a decisive close, and that no body of pacifists was able to induce an inconclusive and illusory peace. Surely, the nation has been stronger and better for the excision of a great moral evil, and for the enrichment of its history by the record of great sacrifices, of noble dedication to high ideals, of the victory of great national vision over narrow views and selfish interests. The heroic men of both sides in that great struggle died not in vain if the nation cemented with their blood shall not forget their sacrifice and the red blood of its manhood shall not be turned to water by the corrupting influence of wealth and ease, and the persuasive sophistries of those who put peace and tranquility above national honor and moral triumph. The history of our country is full of inspiration, if we would but heed it. Its institutions were established by men who faced facts and who looked with clear vision into the future. It is replete with glorious and inspiring instances of high courage and unselfish devotion, not by a few alone, but by multitudes. Our nation was greatest when it most clearly recognized its responsibilities and most courageously stood forward sword in hand to enforce them. Its prestige abroad, its success at home, cannot be advanced by evading its responsibilities or by ignoring the consequences of its acts. We have talked much of late—too much—about peace, without regard to any consideration of what peace entails. Some of us have talked and are still talking about becoming part of a league to enforce peace, apparently without reflecting that such a league is but another name for an offensive and defensive alliance—such as Washington warned against, such as our whole national history and policy runs counter to. Have we sufficiently reflected upon what the obligations of such a league would mean? Some of those who most vociferously have cried out against all military preparedness, have been equally vociferous in favor of such a league. But peace can neither be secured nor maintained by pious wishes or elegant homilies. Peace is a result of conditions favoring it. If we are permanently to surrender our right to exclude the nations of Europe or Asia from the extension of their institutions in

Central or South America, it will be idle to talk of forming an international peace league. Only the presence of such a league of strong and virile nations can make such a league of any value. "Who would be free, *himself* must strike the blow." A nation afraid to face responsibility and to protect its own interests, would not be a valued member of a league of nations to enforce anything. We cannot buy up all of the West Indies to avoid the possibility of some day being compelled to elect between abandoning or fighting for the Monroe Doctrine. It should be a part of our work of constructive patriotism to fit us to play a part harmonious with our traditions and our history when occasion shall arise requiring us to justify our ancestry. Our patriotism must be made of sterner stuff than rhetoric if it is to carry us through great perils. There must be a searching of hearts, a girding up of loins, a recognition of the need to "do noble deeds, not dream them all day long," if our program of constructive patriotism is to fit us to play a great part in the world's history, and to enable America once more to stand with Freedom's banner in her hand, triumphant on the battlements of the greatest citadel of human progress.

MR. BACON: When we started out last year for the Mississippi Valley under the inspiration of the Congress, which had been held in this room, an able Mayor of New York (Applause.) one of our most enthusiastic friends, was one of the first protagonists of our cause. To-night New York is represented by another of her distinguished citizens.

I take great pleasure in introducing the Hon. Martin W. Littleton. (Applause.)

ADDRESS

Hon. Martin W. Littleton of New York

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen: I somehow feel that there is a little note of pessimism in the speeches regarding the willingness of our country to prepare. (Applause.) I somehow feel that, in the utterances of the last few days, brilliant in vision, philosophic in research, splendid in utterance, commanding in influence, there has nevertheless been a sense of reproach and a spirit of rebuke which had been just as well and effectively left out. (Applause.)

We are here through the agency of a Democratic administration to seek to prepare our country. Whether we like the Democratic administration or not, it is the agency now established for the purpose of procuring that preparedness. (Applause.) We can best secure that, both from the men in office and the men who shall be summoned to serve, by trusting their patriotism rather than questioning their judgment and their patriotism combined. (Applause.) And that note of pessimism reaches a little bit too much to the average citizen, and questions, I think, a little bit too much his willingness to serve his country.

I have not doubted, and I do not believe, that on reflection you sincerely doubt, that the young manhood and the young womanhood of this country, when stimulated to service by a recollection of the illustrious path through which this nation has traveled from the beginning, and by the alluring prospect which is held out for its future, if it lives up to the ideals under which it began, I have not doubted, and I do not believe you can doubt, that the patriotism of America, her willingness to serve, is just as great and just as keen and will be just as responsive to-day as in the days of trial in the Revolution or in the Civil War.

At all events, as an optimist, and as one accustomed to plead with people to be persuaded in your direction, I think it a more effective way to assume that the American people will respond to the cause of the country when you are trying to persuade them that it is their duty to do so. The old Greek poet said:

"Defend this land, your common parent and dearest nurse,
Who, on her fostering soil, upheld with bounteous care
Your infant step, and trained you to this serve,
That your hand in her defense might lift the faithful shield."

The command of patriotism has been on the lips of leaders and patriots of every nation. It requires the occasion, it calls for the test, and it demands the exigency or the emergency to awaken in mankind, and in our own country, particularly, the necessity of the discharge of the obligation which men and women owe to that country which undoubtedly they love, if sometimes flippantly they twit.

On a long, white shaft, which stands in one of our Southern cities, softly gleaming under a Southern moon, there is a rain-

washed epitaph, written in memory of a Southern statesman and delivered from his lips:

"Who saves his country saves all things,
And all things saved bless him;
Who lets his country die, lets all things die,
And all things dying, curse him."

This was spoken in the splendid conception of patriotism of men long since buried under the ruins of a Confederacy, men who served and fought, and who thought they enjoyed and had a common ideal with men from New England's templed hills and the great sweep of the West. It was the passion to serve, as they believed, the obligations of their country and to their country. And after all, my friends, it is the passionate reverence and obligation to an ideal which moves and stimulates men and women to serve it in times of national stress.

And I have yet to reach the conclusion that, notwithstanding we have been blessed with the bountiful results of a combination of intelligent citizenship and a glorious and resourceful country, and notwithstanding our borders have been streaming with plenty, our granaries have been full, our homes have been blessed with prosperity, our people enriched, notwithstanding all of that, notwithstanding the belief that there are some who will stand in the way of the country's definite growth, I still believe that

"There is no man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land."

at some time in his obligation to his country.

The little that I shall say—and it only shall be a little—is suggestive, and merely, of hope. I have a conception of a definitive ideal which we should be prepared to defend. I am as much interested in what we are going to defend, as how we are going to defend it. (Applause.) I am as much concerned about the ideals which we preserve in times of peace as I am of the ideals which we defend in times of war. (Applause.) I am a little bit more of a believer in the great dull facts that lie behind these brilliant emblems of our country's liberty than I am in the mere show of color which they blazon forth.

The definitive thing which we should be prepared to defend is that Government which in its essence and all of the attributes, refused to place sovereignty in the hands of its agents, and limited itself in the manner and under the circumstances that our Government limited itself.

If you were to disregard for a minute all of these frightful wastes of war and all of this ghastly loss of life, and ask yourself the question, "What will be the most lasting injury to civilization inflicted by the great war in Europe?" and give yourself time to think, you would answer, "It was because of the utter derangement of all the right notions of government, of liberty, of property, and all the relations which thousands of years have been exhausted in building up, and which it will take hundreds of years again to restore."

If you want to ask yourself what was the cause back, back, back behind everything else, what really was the fundamental contributing, compelling cause of the final clash of arms in Europe, you might say, "industrial rivalry"; you might say, "race antagonism"; you might say, "ancient grudges"; you might say, "racial warfare," but you might come finally to the conclusion that absolutism in government, the governmentizing of men, the governmentizing of property, the socializing of power, and the final destruction of government as a limited agency had as much to do with the precipitation of the war in Europe as any other one single thing. (Applause.)

Take as an illustration the German Empire. I, for one, can speak without the slightest concern on this question, for I belong, not to the pacifist, but what I call the militant America. I do care a great deal individually about how this war shall result, but I can stand off in the controversy and preserve the doctrine of minding my own business with considerable complacency, because I believe it is our obligation to do that. (Applause.) Germany built a government that created model municipalities, that abolished poverty, that provided for old-age pensions, that provided the labor exchanges and that made for her own internal service, but in doing so she made the blunder that every civilization had made from the Caesars and the Athenian Democracy—she deposited sovereignty in the hands of her rulers without restraint, sufficient restraint to prevent them from entering into war when the time should come.

What is the result to-day? Republican France is dismantled, and she has governmentized everything she has got; the Parliamentary Democracy of England has been governmentized, and every ounce of courage and every individualistic energy, every impulse and every piece of property she has is commandeered in the service of the government.

The effect of the absolutism of one country and the war itself has been the derangement of every notion of personal and property right, and will be the derangement for hundreds of years to come. What is the lesson to us? Here on this continent is the finest promise and the last hope of individualism incarnated in an organic instrument destined to protect and pledged to protect that individualism. (Applause.)

What, then, is the definitive ideal of which I speak? An ideal which has put a written Constitution, of which General Wickersham spoke so well, not a Constitution written because it is in writing, not a Constitution written which by enactment may not cease to be a Constitution, but because there is written in the Constitution every limitation upon this government in favor of the individual liberty and of the individual activity of the citizen. Behind everything else is that definitive ideal. If that isn't the ideal of this Republic, if that wasn't the dominant notion of the founders of the Republic, if that isn't the obligation which we must maintain, if those are not the ideals which we must be prepared to defend, then ours, like every other nation, becomes absolute, and differs from no other nation except in language and in mere location.

Somebody says, "What if they amend the Constitution more easily?"

Heaven knows, I draw no political lines here, because it has been said enough on both sides, "Let us amend the Constitution easily." Somebody said the other day, by a majority vote of the State, the point being that if it is in the Constitution, why, it is a Constitutional Government. Of course this never was so, and never can be so. The Constitution is written for the purpose of limiting it in favor of the activities of the man, and civilization, of which he is a part.

And yet, we are willing to make the government absolute. We did it, we are doing it over and over every day, either by evasion or purposed amendment. We are willing to make the

Government absolute except in one particular, and that is the only place it ought to be absolute. The Constitution says in the preamble, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish peace, promote the general welfare, and provide for the common defense, and insure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, this Constitution is ordained."

Now, we never have obeyed the command of the very threshold of the organic law: "provide for the common defense." We never have taken the only absolute power that we have had granted to us. The Government was granted, indeed, it was commanded, to do that specific thing, to provide for the common defense. We are willing to become absolute on prohibition, we are willing to amend the Constitution if anybody thinks it is a good thing to do.

We have gentlemen suggesting that the Supreme Court should be elected by the people and the Constitution should be amended to bring about that result. We have others suggesting that the Supreme Court should be deprived of the power to pronounce a law unconstitutional, we are willing to destroy the organic law of the land, and all these things, which we should be dedicated to defend. But we evade or avoid the one command in the Constitution—to provide for the common defense of the Nation. We never have obeyed and somehow we still seem to feel that we can't do it.

My friends, there is one other suggestion, and then I am through. It was said in the Declaration of Independence that men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, amongst which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These were declared to be the object and the aim of the civilization which we were constructing. These were declared to be inalienable, that they were before there was a government, and that they would be after there had ceased to be a government, and it was said that in order to secure these, governments were instituted amongst men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The end was declared, the object of civilization was brilliantly and luminously expressed, and the means were specified—that is, that the only reason for a government was to secure these rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that the gov-

ernments that would thus secure these were governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

For fifty, sixty or seventy years we held to the dominant faith of that declaration of our political philosophy, that is, that these three great things constituted the Trinity of individualistic civilization, guaranteed and embedded in the organic law of the land. But after a while, we seem to have gotten the means mixed up with the ends, and we consider that governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, was more important than it was to preserve the end for which the government had been organized, to wit, the right of life and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

So we have been emphasizing the last paragraph in the clause for the last twenty-five years, and to the end that that may not continue to the enervation or undermining of a Republic like this, it is well that we should be reminded that what we should be prepared to defend is an organic government, embedded upon stable principles, written in the philosophy of men who have just escaped the shadow of a foreign monarch, and destined to preserve on this continent the finest and last hope of a great individualistic civilization, of which we were supposed to be the finest example and the most illustrious instance.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is one of the definitive ideals which our people must understand, that we should be willing to defend. Now, in a Democracy it is difficult to do this. We must not be impatient with this great Democracy of ours. If we will have everything passed upon by mankind en masse, if we do insist that the largest amount of virtue resides in the widest diffusion of power, if we will have it, that we must refer and refer public questions to the common judgment of mankind, then we must be content and patient with the processes of the nation and the organic establishment of the Nation as we have.

I know it has been well said, Emerson says that Fisher Ames once said a monarchy was like a great merchantman; you get aboard, you rode in great comfort and defied the winds and the tides until you hit a reef, and then you went to the bottom; that a Democracy was like a raft—it never sunk, but, damn it! your feet were always in the water. (Laughter and applause.) That is the doctrine to which we are committed. We must be patient with these processes, we must draw the defense of our

country from the very place of whose lethargy we complain, we must seek our soldiers amongst the very people against whom there is some intimation of reproach. We find our safety and the safety of our nation by drawing from the body of mankind in this nation the men who will defend the ideals to which we are pledged. No man need doubt, no man does sincerely doubt, that an army drawn from the body of a great republic, equipped with the right to have a voice in its affairs, an army made up from the citizenship of the republic, that such an army would ever project a shadow across the brilliant pathway of a great republic. No man need ever doubt that an army thus summoned and thus moulded and thus marshalled and thus mustered in for final service, ever means anything of militarism.

If I had my way—and an humble way it would be—I would build a navy that cost so much and was so large that no nation would ever look at the shores of America and dare to attack us. (Loud applause and cheers.) And then, inside, out of the body of this citizenship, enlightened, stimulated, aroused, awakened by the brilliant teachers from Iowa and the stimulating philosophers from New York, awakened and aroused to their duty and their service, but still citizens, still loyal patriots to their country, we would establish inside the combined defenses which would make these ideals secure, and then we might be able to say, and God help us to say, maybe, after all, the twentieth century will yet record that resplendent reach of time in which liberty and peace—peace, the coveted thing now, perhaps, more coveted in the lands of war than in the lands of peace, will go up and down the nations of the earth, and there will build their kingdoms in the hearts of men, and they will gather the harvest of genius and toil, in which Reason will strike from the hand of Force the sword of hate, and pluck from the heart of War the germ of greed, in which Conscience will smite the thoughts of wrong, and fill the mind with mercy's sweet restraint, and in which power will grow in the human brain, but will refuse the shelter of a glittering crown, and in which the people of all lands and tongues, awakened by the inspiration of our example, will follow in the march of years the luminous pathway, the light of our advancing civilization, that leads to a destiny beyond the reach of our poor vision, but, happily, within the providence of God. I thank you, gentlemen. (Loud applause.)

TOASTMASTER BACON: Before calling upon the last speaker, I want to ask your approval of something that I have done to-night, without permission, in your name. One of our most beloved leaders to-night celebrates his eighty-fifth birthday. I have sent him a telegram in your name, a message of good-will and affection, and I ask your approval. I need not say that I refer to our good old friend, Joseph H. Choate. (Applause.) It is his eighty-fifth birthday.

I desire also to read a telegram from the Governor of New York: (Applause.)

> I regret that the pressure of official business prevents my leaving Albany to-day. I am in entire sympathy with the purposes of the Congress and shall earnestly support the movement looking toward universal military service throughout our land.
>
> CHAS. S. WHITMAN.

The fleet, that we have been so well taught to appreciate by Admiral Mahan, must now be supplemented by a power perhaps of equal importance, the air power. (Applause.) To-night we have the head of the Government Aeronautics Division, whose enthusiasm and energy and indefatigable ability bids fair to put us at last on the road of development of the air power.

I have the great pleasure of introducing Admiral Peary. (Applause.)

ADMIRAL PEARY: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The hour is late, and the minutes drag at this time. I shall be very brief, but I must say a word or two preliminary to my subject. I have been away from Washington for just a week, arriving here at four o'clock this afternoon. During the last three days I have picked up no paper of Portland, Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and this afternoon, Washington, but what I have seen of your proceedings given column after column, many of them upon the front page. I wish to congratulate you upon the legitimate, the dignified interest which your proceedings here are arousing all over the country, and to congratulate upon what must be the impression, under those circumstances, upon the country, of your deliberations here. (Applause.)

AIR POWER FOR THE UNITED STATES

Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary, U.S.N., Chairman National Aerial Coast Patrol Commission

AIR TRAVEL VERSUS LAND AND SEA TRAVEL

Up to the present time commerce and routes of travel have been powerfully affected by geographical features.

Ocean routes have been made long and circuitous by intervening land.

Land routes have been made indirect and tortuous by the necessity of following a valley, avoiding a mountain range, or going round an arm of the ocean.

Every coast line is an obstacle to world commerce and travel.

At a coast line all ocean traffic must stop and transfer freight and passengers.

At a coast line all land traffic must stop and transfer freight and passengers.

With the utilization of the air for travel and transportation all this will be eliminated.

In the ocean of the air there are no coasts, no mountain ranges, no barriers. Its only limit is infinite space.

The route from any point on the earth's surface to any other point will be a straight line between those points. Every spot of land or water will be a port of the ocean of the air.

AIR POWER TO SUPERSEDE SEA POWER.

For centuries great nations have known the value, and striven for the possession of sea power. Some of them are now striving for air power.

And air power of the future will be as much greater than sea power of to-day as the ocean of the air sweeping unbroken around the entire globe, is greater than any land bordered Atlantic or Pacific.

Air power, like sea power, will be of two kinds, military and commercial.

The life and death struggle abroad has focussed first energy and attention on military air power, and is forcing its development with a rapidity that is startling. But with the return of normal conditions the development of commercial air power (the transportation of passengers and freight) will follow.

VITAL LESSON FOR UNITED STATES.

The broadest material lesson for the United States in the present European War is this:

Command of the sea, and command of the land, are worthless without command of the air.

To put it in slightly different form, our military forces, both navy and army, will be useless without a superior and commanding air service.

No attack can be driven home to-day on the European battle fronts without the assistance of the air service.

The Jutland sea fight was dominated by the eyes of a dirigible.

IMPORTANCE OF AIR POWER GRASPED ABROAD

Leaders across the water who are in the thick of things, men on whose shoulders rests the responsibility for the very existence of their respective nations, are saying publicly and officially in thoroughly considered words:

First: That the time is near when the air service of a country will be more vital to its safety than its army and navy combined.

Second: That the decision in the present war may come in the air.

Third: That every country will be obliged to have a separate independent air service by that sheer necessity which knows no law, regards no precedent, fears no government. The very growth and development of air work will force such separate department.

TREMENDOUS AERONAUTIC ADVANCES ABROAD.

What conception have we here (outside of a few) of the astonishing numerical strength of the air services, and the advances in utilization of the air, in foreign countries?

Little Bulgaria, with an area slightly greater than the State of Maine, and a population slightly less than Massachusetts, is said to have some 300 aeroplanes.

The personnel of the French Air Service is said to number more officers and men than our entire army.

The personnel of the British Air Service is said to number more officers and men than our entire navy.

Germany is said to have over 10,000 aeroplanes in commission.

And all this equipment, both material and personnel, is being increased with feverish rapidity.

The following are almost daily news items from the western battle front:

"One hundred and twenty-two allied aeroplanes destroyed in a single month."

"Seventy-two air battles in one day on the western front."

"Two squadrons of thirty aeroplanes each engaged in battle and sixteen are destroyed."

"Seventeen aeroplanes shot down in a single clear night."

"Squadron of thirty or forty battle planes with screen of fast scout planes, make a bombing raid."

According to the reports the allies have brought down 1,800 enemy aeroplanes since the beginning of the war.

Dispatches claim over two hundred lost by one side in a single month.

With half a dozen nations having between 2,000 and 10,000 aeroplanes each, and hundreds of kite balloons and dirigibles, the official reports of the aerial operations of one day would fill a fair-sized book.

Hundreds of such reports come weekly and make us realize the tremendous extent of aerial operations.

And yet that western battle front in a straight line from one end to the other is no longer than the distance from New York to Pittsburg, or the southern boundary of Dakota or Montana or one side of half a dozen of our other States.

UNITED STATES UTTERLY HELPLESS AT PRESENT.

At the present time four foreign powers, probably six, have the men, the machines, the experience and expert knowledge, that would enable any one of them by issuing an order to-day, to destroy Washington or any other of our great coastal cities from the air in a single night two weeks from now.

We have neither aeroplanes nor dirigibles, nor aviators, nor anti-aircraft guns, nor any other means of preventing such destruction. We should be as absolutely helpless as were the inhabitants of London when those terrible machines arrived from Mars in Wells' story, "The War of Worlds."

Recent exploits of the U-53 off Nantucket have brought us face to face with the question, "What would we do if antagonized by a nation possessing a fleet of such fighting machines as the U-53?"

Every layman in the country knows now or should know, that such machines exist, and that the oceans are no barrier to them.

Have we the submarines, the destroyers, or other means to cope successfully with such a menace?

The aeroplane will be the quickest and cheapest antidote for the submarine. Its speed and range of vision are three times that of the fastest destroyer. It can detect and follow a submarine that is entirely invisible to any surface craft. It can destroy the submarine when it comes near the surface.

The following quotation from a letter recently received from Lawrence Sperry, one of a group of brilliant young men, John Hays Hammond, Jr., Trubee Davison, Robert Lovett and others, who will be the salvation of this country in an emergency, contains volumes:

> "As you probably know, near Boston some time ago I was lost at sea at night for fourteen hours, drifting out to sea in my hydroaeroplane. In the morning four destroyers, and two tug boats were sent out by the Charleston Navy Yard—also two aeroplanes. The first aeroplane that left the shore came back in forty minutes and reported my position. The destroyers were out until three o'clock in the afternoon and did not find me at all."

The price of a destroyer would give us fifty to sixty aeroplanes; the price of a battleship would give us 1,000.

AERO COAST DEFENSE SYSTEM IMPERATIVE.

For warning, and for defense and offense against a hostile fleet, a powerful aeroplane coast defense system such as I have advocated and urged, will be not only invaluable to us, but imperative.

Only recently Lord Montagu presented a plan for the air defense of Great Britain after the conclusion of the present war, which contemplated twenty thousand aeroplanes. Compare the coast line of the British Isles with ours.

And yet our coast lines give us this advantage, they furnish us a base from which it will be possible to send out such a cloud

of aeroplanes as would not only completely overwhelm and destroy any air equipment that could be brought against us by a hostile fleet, but could cripple and even destroy the fleet itself.

The price of a battleship with a speed of 23 knots, throwing a broadside of 10 to 12 tons, would give us 1,000 aeroplanes with a speed of 100 miles, able to shower 500 tons or more of high explosives on a hostile fleet.

Do not however get the erroneous idea that I wish to substitute aerial equipment in place of the navy.

Nothing is farther from my thought. I am urging a great air fleet and aero coast defense, in addition to the navy.

PROGRAM ESSENTIAL TO SECURE AIR POWER FOR UNITED STATES.

To give the United States proper air power we need in their order the following:

First: A separate independent Department of Aeronautics with a place in the President's Cabinet.

It is a significant fact that the first indictment in Lord Northcliffe's smashing editorial in the Daily Mail which is credited with having overthrown the recent British Ministry, was that inefficiency resulting from lack of an Air Department had seriously affected the value of the British Air Service on the western front.

The following sequence of first acts of the new British Ministry is even more significant:

"Dec. 19th, the clause establishing the Ministry was read" in the House of Commons.

"For the purposes of this act the President of the Air Board shall be deemed to be a Minister appointed under this Act, and the Air Board a ministry established under this Act."

"Jan. 2nd, the British Government decided to give the Air Minister charge of the entire work of providing aeronautical equipment and personnel for the army and the navy, and Lord Cowdray, said to be one of the best organizers in Great Britain, has been appointed Air Minister."

Second: An aviation class of thousands and thousands of young men throughout the country. Lord Montagu's proposal

for Great Britain's Air Service on a peace basis, contemplates a personnel of 160,000.

Third: A Lord Montagu of American Aeronautics on the floor of Congress, some man of large ability and broad conceptions who can drive home in season and out of season the aeronautic needs of the country.

Fourth: A comprehensive Aero Coast Defense System, along the broad general lines which I have indicated and advocated.

A continuous cordon of sentinel planes well off shore, and large squadron stations near all principal cities for offense against a hostile fleet and protection of the cities from air raids.

Fifth: Some powerful interest backed by large means and experience, which can combine and develop existing conflicting interests and straggling concerns, into a great industry which shall be to the Air Service of this country what Krupp is to Germany and Bethlehem to the United States in their field.

Sixth: A great central aeronautic manufacturing plant, similar to our largest automobile establishments, located in the interior of the country where it can be protected to the last ditch.

COST.

What about cost? Less than a month of present war cost to Great Britain alone, less than a month of war cost to this country if we are antagonized by a first-class power or combination of powers, will inaugurate these vital things.

A bond issue is the solution of the cost problem.

If we are to have a real defense we must begin developing our aerial strength *now* and push it with unsparing energy.

We shall not have started on a proper pace of development of this vital arm until we are spending not less than $50,000,000 a year on the building of our air service.

It is said that Canada this year is to expend $80,000,000 on aeronautics.

We have the wealth, the resources, the ingenuity. Only by developing to the utmost our ability for air fighting—only by securing and holding dominating air power can we make our defense secure.

In conclusion I again invite your earnest attention to the full meaning of the statement:

Command of the sea, and command of the land, are worthless without command of the air.

The millions expended on our navy and army will be wasted, the millions devoted to the Panama Canal thrown away, the billions of value in our great cities jeopardized, and the existence of the Nation endangered, unless we have such an air fleet as will give the United States unquestioned command of the air for the continent of North America.

Mr. Bacon: This concludes the program for this evening, and the meeting stands adjourned.

Report of the Committee on Patriotism Through Education

As a preliminary to the work of the Committee at Washington, small conferences of members were held in Boston, January 18th; in New York January 23d; in Washington January 24th and 25th. The last of these meetings approved this report, prepared by a sub-committee, and voted to lay it before the general meeting as a basis of discussion and action.

This document is not a catalogue of things, all of which must be done, but an outline of possibilities. Perhaps some things, on due consideration and discussion, will need to be eliminated; some additions will be necessary; then selections must be made of those points of view and methods of approach which must be undertaken first, as being both necessary and practicable.

1. WHAT IS THE NEEDED MESSAGE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE?

A. Purpose of the Committee.

1. The first task of the Committee on **Patriotism Through Education** must manifestly be to come to an understanding as to the scope and extent of the work which it may undertake. The function of this new Committee is to affect a public mind which is not sufficiently aware of national necessities and possibilities. All members of the National Security League believe that the United States is not at present so organized as to make full use of its technical and human capacities. It is not living a complete life. We want to arouse it.

To accomplish this end, we have it in mind to appeal by educational methods, and in co-operation with other educational agencies, to young and old. Success in such a great undertaking requires an understanding with reference to the principles that are to be urged, to the doctrine that is to be inculcated, and to the points of view to be set forth. We must have something resembling a platform, because otherwise different agencies and speakers will controvert each other. The only hope of making a strong impression is a distinct understanding at the outset as to what we are trying to do.

As a means toward this end, your Committee has sought to analyze the possible points of appeal, which fall within the general purpose of the National Security League—some of which, at least, should be included in the program of Patriotic Education.

B. The Spirit of Patriotism.

The Committee is founded on a belief in a national patriotism which may be aroused by:

1. **A Sense of Obligation**—Efforts to make the young and old feel a strong obligation to their country—a development of the underlying idea of **service** at all times, and complete service of everyone in a position to contribute in time of crisis. An effort to make patriotism natural, universal and fundamental and based on constructive intelligence rather than upon mere emotionalism.

2. This implies **an education of the citizen** of such a character as **to render him an effective unit** in a democracy. He should be both able and willing to serve to the limit of his capacity.

3. **The spirit of co-operation and organization**—In addition to being an effective unit, the citizen should be educated to a spirit of co-operation—to work with others, striving for the same end; and to offer his special or peculiar abilities when they may be needed, in a public way, to the best advantage.

4. **A Sense of Patriotism**—In doing well one's daily task—as not only a duty to one's self but a contribution to the welfare and safety to the counry.

C. Patriotism Through National Efficiency.

This is one of the most needed forms of genuine love of country; for it is known to everybody that there is a great waste of energy in applying our natural resources of materials, and of men and women and children, to national needs.

1. **Governmental Reorganization**—Absolutely essential for any success—it includes:

(a) **A Responsible Financial System**—Congress must learn to apply all the national funds to real national needs.

(b) **Economy and Efficiency** in national, State, municipal and local governments; so that the taxes and sacrifices of the nation may be used to the best advantage.

2. **Conservation.**

(a) Of Human Beings.

(b) Of Natural Resources.

3. **Commercial and Industrial Reorganizations**—With a view to making the wealth and organizing power of the country available when most needed.

(a) **Manufacturing Trades and Mining**—With reference to possible natural needs in time of stress.

(b) **Agriculture**—Improved yield and better marketing conditions.

(c) **Land Transportation**—We must have a readjustment of railroads including stragetic lines, connections, bridges, tunnels, sidings, cars suitable for heavy weights, etc. Roads also must be improved up to a military standard.

(d) **Water Transportation**—Improvements of rivers, lakes and harbors with a view to military use; construction of defensive harbors; registering and controlling merchant shipping, etc.

(e) **Conservation** of natural resources and of human beings.

(f) Recognition and use of **trained men** for public and private service.

4. **Administrative Reorganization**—Quite as important as the military organization, and much more difficult to obtain—it includes:

(a) **Authority in the Departments**—The development of initiative.

(b) **Bureau Organization**—Needs to be simplified and brought to responsibility, especially in the War and Navy Departments.

5. **Heed to Experts**—Greater attention to the views and plans of professional soldiers and scientific men in Government functions.

6. **Educational Reorganization.**

(a) **Vocational Schools**—As a means of efficiency.

(b) **Patriotism in all Schools.**

(c) **Efficient methods of teaching and study.**

(d) Need of availing ourselves of interest of young Americans in athletic sports.

D. Patriotism Through Knowledge of Difficulties.

1. **Knowledge of the present world conditions**—Both international and military.

2. **Effect of changes in economic and military methods**—We must get people away from thinking of the world in terms of the 18th and the 19th centuries.

3. **Warnings of American statesmen as to our needs**—There is a literature of discussions of unpreparedness from Washington to Wilson, by eminent statesmen and soldiers.

4. **Effect of the European War on our conditions.**

E. Present Defensive Needs of the Country.

A subject little understood by laymen and insufficiently treated by the press.

1. **Present possibilities of invasion.**

2. **Need of Modern Fortifications**—Including also mines, submarines and other coast defenses.

3. **Need of modern material of war.**—Rifles, big guns, aeroplanes, motor transport, railway material, etc.

4. **Need of larger forces**—Military, naval, specialized services such as aeronautics, etc.

5. Reorganization of military supply and transportation.

6. Need of adequate development of modern camps for training and healthful maintenance of the army.

F. Special Case of Universal Military Training.

1. **Educative effects**—Health, obedience, order, discipline, knowledge of other men.

2. **Application to both young men and young women**—Training and nursing, clerical work, cooking, preparation of material, etc.

3. **Availability for service**—Difference between raw and trained men, saving of life, money and length of campaigns.

4. **Antidote to militarism**—Effect of a citizen army and of proper preparation as a preventive against attacks.

5. **Democracy**—Common service instead of hired service; mixing up of men in the ranks; appreciation of the sentiment of other sections of the country.

6. **Recognition of responsibility of all in the nation for national defence.**

II. POSSIBLE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE.

Out of the variety of suggestions that have been made to the Committee and in the Committee looking to positive action, the following are selected. Not all of them can be put into operation at once, and some of them may have to be given up on closer examination:

A. Point of view of the Committee's work.

The Committee avows that the purpose of its work is to create in America an undivided and effective national spirit; to organize the individual and collective power of the nation so as to bring it to bear on national problems through democratic instrumentalities; to emphasize the nation's needs and opportunities so that each citizen will gladly give the necessary time to training for personal service whenever needed; and to establish a national moral standard and idealism through appeals to patriotism. In national preparedness, reorganization and education we believe is the safest road to peace. In training for personal service, for old and young, in moderate military training and Governmental and industrial reorganization, we see the best development of personal and national character; and in all this we see the only wise preparedness for defense from foreign invasion and domestic discord.

B. Co-operation with other agencies for affecting public opinion.

1. U. S. Bureau of Education, State Departments of Education and other educational organizations.

2. **General National Societies**—Devoted to the improvement of the conditions and government of the American people.

3. **Organizations.**

4. **Good Government Clubs** and reform organizations.

5. **Organizations of professional and business men** interested in general betterment.

6. **Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade.**

7. **Fraternal orders, labor organizations, etc.**

8. **A variety of other organizations.**

9. **Patriotic societies.**

10. **Rotary clubs, economic clubs** and similar organizations.

11. **Farmers' institutes and conventions.**

C. Aid to Education and Educators.

This requires great care in order to prevent the supposition that the Committee is attempting some sort of political propaganda. It is im-

possible for the Committee to establish a new system of education, public or private; it can only insist on the teaching of patriotic ideals—on training in the principles of American Government, and can aid in efforts to that end.

1. **Civic Education**—Influence towards improving the textbooks and courses in American Government in the lower schools, High Schools and college and scientific schools.

2. **American History**—Improvement in school textbooks so as to influence against texts which perpetuate errors with regard to the wars and international relations of the United States; also toward a requirement for all public schools that every pupil in the grammar schools and in the High Schools take at least one year's course in American history, including proper accounts of the relations of America with foreign power.

3. **Vocational Education**—Influence and stress on proper vocational education as a method by which boys and girls in large numbers can be prepared to take their part in the social and industrial organization which is necessary for the defense and welfare of the Republic.

4. **Circulating Libraries**—A system of circulation of books or collections of books bearing upon national efficiency and preparedness. The Wisconsin "package library method" is especially to be kept in mind.

5. **Associations of Teachers**—Efforts to reach the national and local organizations of teachers; to inform them on the subject; to furnish them with literature; and interest them in preparedness in a large sense, social and industrial.

6. **Military Training in Schools**—Such differences of opinion exist among teachers and military men as to the desirability of military drill in schools that the Committee makes no recommendations on that point at present.

D. Public Discussions.

The Committee would like to take advantage of the numerous forums and other opportunities for exchange of views before audiences, and might furnish speakers and make arrangements for some of the following specific methods:

1. **Debates and Discussions** in higher institutions of learning.

2. **Public discussions** with the persons opposed to the principles of the Committee in cities.

3. **Utilization of the organized Public Forums** such as the Cooper Institute in New York.

E. Preparation of Printed Material.

Including some of the following projects:

1. **Report on Military Systems of Countries Akin to the United States in Conditions and Government**—To be prepared by a commission or commissions sent to investigate the Argentine, Australian and Swiss systems on the ground. Very important—indispensable for a clear understanding.

2. **Military History**—A book on the Army and Navy and the wars bringing out the actual difficulties, successes and failures, as against the prevalent notions.

3. **"The Fathers on Military Training"**—A volume which shall include quoted extracts from the opinions of responsible statesmen, military men and writers, on the defects of the no-organization system.

4. **A "Book of Preparedness"**—To contain authentic and verified statements as to the present military and naval conditions of the United States and the tasks which may be thrown upon our Government.

5. **Briefs on Preparedness**—A set of briefs on various controverted questions with analyses and specific reference to the literature—available for essay writers and debaters.

6. **Brochures**—Brief publications in the form of modern tracts with illustrations.

7. **Comparative Military Systems**—Bringing out the volunteer armies; armies conscripted by lot or other selection; two- or three-year universal service; brief military training.

F. System of Nation-wide Lectures and Addresses.

1. **Series**—Formal works to be issued in uniform shape, so as to make a series of "Security Publications."

2. **Scope**—Agreement to be had by the speakers as to what the essential principles of the National Security League are, and how they shall be presented to the public as part of the educational program, entirely free from any suggestion of politics.

3. **Speakers**—To be, in part, men and women who give their whole time to the service; in part, men and women, including many college and school teachers, who can give only part of their time.

4. **Method**—Cycles of lectures on the general theme, to be delivered throughout the country in cities, towns and rural communities, at stated periods either by one person or by a combination of speakers, the purpose being to give these lectures the widest publicity.

5. **Relations to the Audience**—Questions and quiz to be encouraged.

6. **Proper Subjects**—Among the subjects to be treated would naturally be included some of the following: Nature of Patriotism; Examples of Patriots and Patriotism; Organization of the National Government; Place of States in the American Governmental System; Place of Cities; Commercial and Industrial Organization in Relation to the Defense and Support of the Government; Rights and Obligations of Labor; Why There is Force in Government (Police, Criminal Justice, Armies, Militia, etc.); Military and Naval Systems of the World; Defensive History of the United States; Defense Organization of the United States Government; Life in the American Navy; Life in the American Army; Military Systems of Europe; Short Training Systems of the World; Patriotism of Efficiency; Diplomatic Methods and Spirit.

7. **Expense**—Preliminary provision for overhead expenses and for traveling expenses; and payments to enable those participating to give the necessary time.

8. **A Follow-up System**—Which should clinch the results of lectures, create branch Leagues and keep the whole movement in the minds of the people.

G.—Use of the Press.

Every rational movement of this kind must make use of the medium which reaches the largest number of people, in some of the following ways:

1. **Journalistic Syndicates**—A plan for a systematic editorial service is under consideration as a separate enterprise by a group of New York journalists.

2. **Magazine Articles**—Perhaps aided by prizes—illustrated articles have great effect.

3. **Special Use of Periodicals of Large Circulation,** such as the organs of the great fraternal orders.

H. Appeals to the Eye.

The Committee believes that one of the most effective of all methods for affecting public opinion is by concrete illustration, as, for example:

1. **Use of maps, charts and diagrams** as illustrating ends.

2. **Pageants**—Showing the development of the American Army and and Navy and civil and military establshments and historical incidents.

3. **Lantern Slide Lectures**—To be in every case accompanied by good talk; slides can be shown in many cases where movies are not allowed on account of dangers of fire.

3. **Movies**—If a good scenario could be prepared under the direction of the Committee and could then be carefully worked out with accurate costumes and settings, it would be one of the most effective agencies for the propaganda.

III. PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

A. A National Commission on Patriotism Through Education.

1. Organization of the Committee.

To be based, as far as possible, on organizations already existing, such as: Colleges, universities and technical schools; national societies interested in governmental reform; normal schools; school systems of States or cities; fraternal orders; national business and commercial organizations; local organizations of similar kind sufficient in number of members, etc.

2. Conditions of Membership.

Each society which takes part to designate a representative who shall be a member of the general National Committee.

B. A Council of States—One or more directors from each State to act as State centers, and as a general advisory body.

C. A Committee of One Hundred in Finance.

D. An Executive Committee.

1. **Members**—To be five, appointed by the League; and all the members to meet at a central point several times a year.
2. **Authority**—To carry out the program of the Committee, in concert with the general authorities of the League.
3. **Finance**—A systematic plan and budget for one year, backed up by funds guaranteed in advance to cover the expenses of the year, before any obligations are incurred.

E. Sub-Committees.

Including one on Relations With Other Organizations.

Communications with regard to this reform may be addressed to Secretary of National Security League, 31 Pine Street, New York City.

Presented on behalf of the Committee on Patriotism through Education by

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART,
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ARTHUR E. BESTOR,
Chautauqua Institute, Chicago.

S. STANWOOD MENKEN,
National Security League, New York City.

THOMAS F. MORAN,
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind.

CALVIN W. RICE,
Am. Soc. Mechanical Engineers, New York City.
Sub-Committee on Report.

APPENDIX B.

Report of the Sub-Committee on the Army

Early in November, 1916, the Executive Committee passed a resolution authorizing its chairman, Mr. S. Stanwood Menken, to appoint a committee to make a report on the defects of the National Defense Act. In conformity therewith, Mr. Menken appointed a committee consisting of:

Frederic L. Huidekoper, Chairman; Colonel William C. Church, Captain Matthew E. Hanna, Colonel Charles E. Lydecker, J. Mayhew Wainwright, Major William H. Wiley, Eric Fisher Wood, Hon. Robert Bacon, Herbert Barry and S. Stanwood Menken, ex-officio, and this committee now has the honor to submit the following report:

The latest Federal legislation pertaining to the re-organization of the military establishment as a whole was embodied in the Act of Congress entitled "An Act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense and for other purposes" (Public No. 85—64th Congress, H. R. 12,766), which was approved by the President on June 3, 1916. This is the so-called National Defense Act, which will be the subject of this report.

The present European war has served one useful purpose at least to the United States. It has been more successful than any other medium in arousing many Americans at last to a realization of the necessity for adequate national defense, both on land and sea. As a rule, this realization has been found to be strongest among our people in closest proximity to the Atlantic coast. This is probably due in a large degree to a greater knowledge of, and more intimate affiliation in business or otherwise with, Europe and Great Britain than in the case of people living in other parts of our country, whose interest in national defense appears to diminish in proportion to their remoteness to our eastern seaboard and their relations with Europe. Indeed, in some parts of the United States the public interest in this vital question is almost *nil*—a state of mind which, we feel sure, is attributable to ignorance, a failure to appreciate how intimate are the affiliations between great nations at the present day, a sublime but wholly unfounded belief in American invincibility,

and a conviction that no other Power will venture to attack us under any circumstances. On the other hand, it is gratifying to be able to record that in many localities the necessity for proper national defense has become a burning question, and that the pressure of public opinion has developed to such an extent that Congress was compelled to respond by enacting the measure which we are about to consider.

The National Defense Act with which this report is concerned may be divided, roughly speaking, into four parts according to the subjects dealt with, viz.: (1) the Regular Army; (2) the reserves of officers and men; (3) the National Guard; and (4) preparedness in matériel and other sundry matters. The recommendations of the War College Division of the General Staff, which were embodied in a separate bill for the consideration of Congress, cover only the first and second parts above enumerated and merely make general recommendations in respect to the third and fourth.

After an exhaustive study of The National Defense Act, your Committee is gratified to be able to report that this measure contains the following

MERITS.

PART ONE—PERTAINING TO THE REGULAR ARMY

This portion of the law, in spite of its many defects, is unquestionably the most comprehensive legislation in respect to the Regular Military Establishment thus far enacted by Congress, especially considering the comparatively short time which elapsed between the introduction of "the Chamberlain bill" in the Senate and "the Hay bill" in the House of Representatives, and the passage of the measure as finally adopted by the Conference Committee of both houses.

It is manifest from the law that Congress was animated by a more genuine sense of patriotism than has characterized most of its military legislation in the past. Greater heed was paid to the advice and recommendations of the General Staff and military experts than has heretofore been the case. This fact presages better and more scientific legislation in the future, based on the counsels of those best qualified to have their judgment followed.

The Regular Army has been increased, in authorized peace strength, from 81,932 to 208,338 enlisted men—of whom 163,161 are to be fighting troops—and in war strength from 128,653 to 287,846, of whom 226,649 will be fighting troops.

The number of Regular Army officers has been augmented proportionately to 11,327 on a peace footing and 11,942 on a war footing.

Notable improvements have been made in the details of organization, in the strength given to various units from the company up, and to the different departments and corps.

The aviation section of the Signal Corps has been more than doubled.

The period of enlistment has been shortened from four years active service with the colors to a maximum of three years, with a proviso for a minimum service of one year if proficiency as a solder has been attained in that time—an admirable innovation.

For the first time in our military history the Regular Army has been given an expansive organization. When war is impending or has actually broken out, the President can, in his discretion, forthwith increase the size of the Military Establshment to the maximum without having to wait for further authorization or action on the part of Congress. This expansive organization was long ago adopted by every great army in the world. Had such a measure stood in our statute books from the beginning of the Revolution our various wars would have been infinitely less costly in men and treasure than they actually were, and the Government would not have been forced to rely to such an extent as it invariably has upon untrained or raw troops.

A much more effective Regular Army Reserve has been established than that originally created by the faulty provisions of the Act of August 24, 1912.

Men who enter the Regular Army as second lieutenants from any source except that of West Point are to be given provisional appointment for two years only, at the termination of which their continuance in the service is made dependent upon their qualifying as to professional, physical and moral fitness.

The increase in the Army is to be made gradually in five annual increments, but in the event of national emergency the total increase authorized by this law can be made immediately.

Stricter examinations and in higher grades than heretofore are now required of officers about to be promoted.

The Army has been increased by 822 extra officers, so as to permit the performance of duties exacted by statute law—such as instructors for the National Guard and at educational institutions, military attachés, etc. This duty has formerly compelled the detachment of officers from the troops with which they were serving, often in such numbers that the morale, discipline and efficiency of the troops were seriously impaired.

Recognizing the truth of the adage that "You cannot get something for nothing," Congress has wisely provided nominal pay for the soldiers in the Regular Army Reserve.

Steps have been taken to utilize employees of all departments of the Government in matters pertaining to the various reserves. This will serve materially to popularize the military service—a *sine qua non* if we are ever to have a real army. Moreover, the machinery of the Government which must necessarily be used in time of war is thus set in motion in time of peace. Provision is made, by means of remuneration, for securing in an emergency the greatest possible number of men who have formerly been trained in the Regular Army.

PART TWO—RELATING TO THE RESERVES OF OFFICERS AND MEN

The National Defense Act creates for the first time a body destined to produce the officers to command the additional forces needed in time of war. This is entitled the Officers' Reserve Corps.

It also provides, under the title of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, a system whereby the candidates for the Officers' Reserve Corps and others shall receive training at schools, colleges, universities and other educational institutions, with troops in field exercises and other instruction. To this end, units classified into two divisions, a senior and a junior, variously constituted of the different arms of the service are to be established at educational institutions which maintain elective or compulsory courses in military training or study, under the supervision of a Regular Army officer detailed for that purpose. Membership in this Reserve Officers' Training Corps comprises boys from the age of 14 years upwards. For their further instruction training camps of not more than six weeks' duration per annum are established.

Training camps modeled on the lines of the Plattsburg camps of 1915 and 1916 are also provided for older men, the expenses of these camps and individuals to be defrayed by the Federal Government.

The appointment of Reserve Officers as temporary second lieutenants in the Regular Army, for a period not to exceed six months in time of peace and with pay at the rate of one hundred dollars ($100.00) per month, is a feature highly to be commended.

Under the title of the Enlisted Reserve Corps is created a reservoir from which can be drawn the skilled operatives required by an army. These include bridge builders, chauffeurs, hospital attendants, nurses, telegraphers, railway operatives, etc.

PART THREE—PERTAINING TO THE ORGANIZED MILITIA OR NATIONAL GUARD.

The National Defense Act repeats the oft-enunciated principle that the militia consists of all able-bodied male citizens between the ages of 18 and 45 years and of all able-bodied males of foreign birth between the same ages who have declared their intention to become citizens.

It divides the militia into three classes, viz.: (1) the National Guard; (2) the Naval Militia; and (3) the unorganized militia.

No less than sixty-three sections—namely, Sections 7 to 119, both inclusive—of the National Defense Act are devoted to the National Guard. In brief, the merits of this part of the law—if a system fundamentally so unsound as our militia system can be said to possess merit—is to be found in the attempt to provide a substantial increase in the Federal power over, and control of, the Organized Militia, which is entitled the National Guard in this Act.

The encouragement given to shooting and the establishment of indoor and outdoor rifle ranges "under such a comprehensive plan as will ultimately result in providing adequate facilities for rifle practice in all sections of the country" are features which cannot be too highly commended.

PART FOUR—TREATING OF PREPAREDNESS IN MATÉRIEL AND OTHER SUNDRY MATTERS

Manufacturing and other industrial plants are required to give precedence to all Government orders for arms, ammunition and other war matériel. Upon failure to comply, the President is given power to seize such plants and to have them operated for the benefit of the Government, while the responsible officials are made liable to a heavy fine and imprisonment for such refusal.

A non-partisan board is created, the functions of which are to take the necessary steps to effect the mobilization of such national industries as are essential for military preparedness.

Investigations are ordered to be made for the purpose of determining whether it be desirable that the Government embark in the manufacture of arms, munitions, equipments and other war matériel.

Authorization is given for the purchase of such tools and other implements and machinery as are needed for the manufacture of war matériel.

As this country has in the past been largely dependent upon Chile for its supply of sodium nitrate—which is essential in the manufacture of explosives—and as this source might readily be cut off in time of war, Congress wisely provided for the obtaining of nitrates by the Government.

For the first time comprehensive measures have been taken to insure the protection of the uniform of the United States Army, Navy and Marine Corps. The wearing or misuse of the uniform is very properly punished by fine or imprisonment or both.

DEFECTS.

Your Committee finds that the bill is characterized by the following defects:

Congress has failed, as usual, to follow completely the advice of the General Staff, but, even if it had, the measure would have fallen far short of providing adequate national defense. This may be attributed in part to the General Staff finding it necessary to revise its opinions constantly, owing to the rapid developments in military affairs in Europe at the present time.

Your Committee also believes that a tendency is noticeable on the part of the General Staff to advocate such measures as it thinks will meet with Congressional approval or suit political conditions, rather than to submit a thorough plan embodying all that is needed for national defense. Furthermore, it is by no means improbable that the

recommendations of the General Staff are frequently influenced by the attitude of the Administration.

The National Guard is still depended upon as an integral—indeed the major—part of the first line of defense. For this role it is wholly unfitted by reason of its faulty organization, insufficient numbers and meagre training. These defects have in no wise been rectified by the National Defense Act in its attempt to increase the Federal authority over the organized militia by wresting from the States the control vested in them by the Constitution—an attempt which by its very nature must necessarily prove abortive.

In the restrictions placed upon the General Staff Congress, in spite of an ostensible increase made in the number of officers thereof, has materially crippled this all-important corps. That an adequate General Staff is the very foundation of military efficiency is a maxim universally accepted. In spite of this, Congress has expressly prohibited the employment of more than half the officers of the General Staff Corps "in or near the District of Columbia," where the national capital, the War Department, the Army War College and the headquarters of the General Staff are all situated. The effect of this is to reduce the number of officers of this corps available for the most important General Staff duties far below the smallest allowable minimum. The Act of February 14, 1903, creating the General Staff Corps, prescribes these duties as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the duties of the General Staff Corps shall be to prepare plans for the national defense and for the mobilization of the military forces in time of war; to investigate and report upon all questions affecting the efficiency of the Army and its state of preparation for military operations; to render professional aid and assistance to the Secretary of War and to general officers and other superior commanders, and to act as their agents in informing and co-ordinating the action of all the different officers who are subject under the terms of this Act to the supervision of the Chief of Staff; and to perform such other military duties not otherwise assigned by law as may be from time to time prescribed by the President."

This has never been repealed, but, notwithstanding this fact, Congress has now imposed restrictions which make impossible the performance of the functions prescribed for the General Staff of every great army.

Your Committee is informed, upon excellent authority, that the military information concerning the present war in Europe collected with great care and expense by our military attachés and possessing untold value for our Army, has not yet been analyzed by our General Staff, except in so far as was necessary properly to file the same. The routine current business of the General Staff has so occupied the few officers of that corps on duty in Washington that no officer has been available for the study of this military information which is vital to our own Army. What a potent example is this of the pernicious effect which the National Defense Act has already had on the efficiency of our General Staff!

Congress failed to provide for the establishment of a system of depots such as every other army has found it imperative to adopt and without which chaos in the mobilization and training of armed forces is inevitable.

In the enlistment period the division of time into active and reserve service, although an improvement over the former law, is still distinctly faulty. The law provides for a total enlistment of seven years, three in active service with the colors, followed by four in the reserve. It is a mathematical fact, which no amount of argument will change, that when the period of service with the colors is made longer than one-third of the entire term of enlistment, no considerable reserve can be accumulated. It therefore follows that, if it be deemed advisable to maintain the term of enlistment at seven years, the period of active service with the colors ought to be shortened to two years.

In framing the National Defense Act, it is apparent that Congress has at last recognized the fundamental principle that the enlisted man should be kept in the Army the minimum time necessary to train him to be a soldier; that he should then be returned to civil life; and that his place in the ranks should be filled by a new man. The essence of this principle is a thoroughly democratic army, whereas the professional army, maintained by voluntary service and high pay, is the essence of that obsolete, militaristic and most plutocratic system from which at last we are slowly breaking away. The law, however, has signally failed to give this modern principle full scope.

No bonus should be paid for the service of former soldiers who are to do duty outside the limits of continental United States, as is prescribed in this law. Under the proper system, a Regular Army should be so constituted that, in conjunction with the Regular Army Reserve, it should furnish the number of men needed in any emergency for the first line of defense.

The National Defense Act fails completely to grapple with the question of the equalization of promotion in the Regular Army. This subject has been a burning question in the service for many years, but Congress has left it as far from solution as heretofore.

PART TWO—RELATING TO THE RESERVES OF OFFICERS AND MEN.

While the establishment of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the training prescribed therefor are admirable innovations, your Committee would be derelict if it neglected to point out the danger that the nation may overestimate the value of the training and consequently place too great reliance on these men as a military asset. It must be apparent to the veriest tyro that training and instruction for officers limited "to a period not to exceed fifteen days in any one calendar year" will be utterly insufficient. In the light of all past experience, and more particularly that of the European war, months of additional training must necessarily be given these officers before

they will be fit to command troops in actual hostilities. Until such training be given the members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, it would be folly to rely upon them as fit for service in war.

Your committee therefore sounds a note of warning against any tendency to incorporate these officers into our first line of defense, where only men who have undergone the highest training have any place. Failure to appreciate this fact will only repeat the errors often made in respect to the National Guard—errors which Congress has not yet fully realized after a century and a quarter of national existence.

The introduction of units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps into educational institutions is another excellent innovation in that it will go far to arouse and stimulate a proper conception of the democratic principle that every able-bodied man owes military service to his country. In addition, it will furnish a source of supply for the Officers' Reserve Corps, but it is open to the same objections and criticisms as the Officers' Reserve Corps, for the reason that there is grave danger that too much dependence will be placed upon it as a national military asset. It bears close analogy to the half-baked measures so characteristic of our military legislation in the past—the broken reeds on which we have leant from the beginning of our national career.

The establishment of Training Camps for men other than those in the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and modelled on the lines of the Plattsburg Camps of 1915 and 1916, is another admirable feature, but again your committee feels bound to sound a note of warning against too much reliance being placed upon the output of these camps.

Admirable though these three features be, they none the less constitute the first step and the first step only—in the proper direction. They will however serve a useful purpose in one particular at least, viz: that of leavening the population with men who by their own experience realize how much there is to be learned in the military profession and how fallacious is the prevalent American opinion that an officer or a soldier can be made in a few months. It should be self-evident that these men cannot be depended upon for service in the first line, either as officers or enlisted men, until they have received months of additional intensive training.

PART THREE—RELATING TO THE ORGANIZED MILITIA

The militia provisions of the National Defense Act seek to Federalize the National Guard, so-called. This title is a complete misnomer because the force in question is not national, is not a guard, and is of no use to the nation as a whole until its status is changed from a State to a Federal Force. In the opinion of some of the ablest lawyers in the United States this Federalization cannot be effected without an amendment to the Constitution. Your committee

cannot lay too much emphasis upon the fact that national existence is often dependent upon military strength. Under any circumstances, therefore, Congress was distinctly at fault in placing so great a reliance upon the National Guard, about which such well-grounded doubt exists regarding its status under the Constitution. This action is the more to be condemned because, under the National Defense Act, the National Guard constitutes the bulk of the force which may be called upon to safeguard the national destinies. The people have been led to believe that they have been provided with proper defense on land, whereas in reality they are leaning upon another broken reed.

Your Committee desires to state with particular emphasis that, if its strictures upon the militia appear to be unduly harsh, it is considering that force purely as a military asset and is striving to ascribe to it the proper value as such an asset. We yield to no one in our appreciation of the unselfish motives which have animated the militia and volunteers in our past history. The sacrifices of business and family interests made by them for the purpose of serving their country, and the personal courage that they have shown, with few exceptions, cannot be too strongly commended. If, therefore, they have fallen short of the standard that the United States has a *right* to demand of the troops to whom it entrusts its national destinies, the blame must not be laid at the door of these patriotic men individually. The fault is to be found in the fact that they have invariably been, and still are, the victims of a most pernicious system, and it is against that system that your committee's criticisms are directed.

Once again Congress has demonstrated its persistent belief that Federal pay is the panacea which will rectify all evils in the National Guard, and that this pay will stimulate voluntary enlistment and increase the efficiency of that force. As a matter of fact, the pork barrel is now open at both ends, and expenditures for the pay of the National Guard, but quite apart from the sums appropriated for arms, equipment and other military supplies, may reach the enormous total of $75,000,000 *per annum* under this Act. It would be difficult enough to justify such expenditures, even if they produced dependable troops for the first line, but under the system established by this measure such a *desideratum* is a physical impossibility. Your committee is therefore unanimous in condemning the pay feature as unqualifiedly pernicious.

In support of this conviction the following facts are quoted from a letter to the editor of the New York Times written by the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, under date of March 20, 1916:

"In 1903, under the Dick law, we instituted the policy of making payments to the National Guard for the purpose of recruiting up its numbers and improving its discipline. These appropriations covered not only arms, ammunition, and supplies, but pay, subsistence, transportation for the men during their manoeuvres in the field, and also aid to the various State encampments as well as to the joint manoeuvres. Beginning with appropriations aggregating about two and

one-half millions a year they were steadily increased until we are now paying six millions a year to the militia. Simultaneously the numbers of the Guard have diminished in comparison with the populaton of the country. Money has failed to give us numbers. In 1903 the National Guard consisted of 116,542 officers and men. In 1915 it consisted of 129,398 officers and men. The population of the country by the census of 1900 was less than 76,000,000. In 1915 it is reported as over 100,000,000."

With a sublime disregard for these facts, Congress has prescribed that the enlisted men of the National Guard in each State shall number, at the end of one year, 200 for each Senator and Representative in Congress from such State; and that the number shall be increased 50 per cent. each year until not less than 800 enlisted men for each Senator and Representative are reached. There is every reason to believe that nothing approaching these numbers can possibly be attained even in the thickly populated States. In the sparsely settled communities of the West the folly of such a course is apparent. Even greater is the folly of imposing conditions which the States can avoid under their constitutional right.

Nor have Federal payments to the militia resulted in a high standard of efficiency. In 1915, after twelve years of such assistance under the Dick law, according to official statistics, one-sixth of the officers and men were absent from the annual inspection. In 1914, the average number of men absent from each weekly drill was nearly 50 per cent. of the entire strength of the organized militia, 37 per cent. failed to attend the twenty-four drills required in each year—a minimum of instruction so low as to be absurd. The instruction of 330 companies was rated as poor and 932 companies were below the standard of efficiency prescribed. Only about one-third of our organized militia were rated as indifferent marksmen or could attain the lowest standard recognized in our military shooting.

A few points taken at random, but characteristic of the militia provisions, will suffice to show how ill-digested is this part of the National Defense Act. Congress has forbidden the States to maintain troops in time of peace "other than as authorized in accordance with the organization prescribed under this Act." But beneath this mandate there evidently lurked a suspicion that it was trespassing on the rights of the States under the Constitution, inasmuch as it went on to provide in the same section (Section 61) "That nothing contained in this Act shall prevent the organization and maintenance of State police or constabulary." This is a fair example of beating the devil around the bush because, under the guise of State police or constabulary, the States could easily defeat this provision of the law.

Section 68 recognizes the Constitutional right of the States and Territories to locate the units and headquarters of the National Guard within their respective boundaries. Such locations may be directly contrary to those advocated by the General Staff and thus give rise to endless confusion and chaos.

Congress has made it mandatory that the organization of the National Guard shall conform to that of the Regular Army, yet it prescribes that the term of enlistment in it shall be six years—the first three in active service with the colors and the remaining three in the National Guard Reserve—whereas, as has been stated earlier in this report, the term of enlistment in the Regular Army is seven years, three with the colors and four in the reserve. The two do not therefore harmonize.

The discipline and training of the National Guard are also to conform to the standard prescribed for the Regular Army. Heretofore the Federal Government has lacked the power to compel obedience to this standard and Congress has sought to rectify this condition by means of increased pay to the National Guard. As ex-Secretary of War, Stimson, points out in the letter to which we have already alluded:

"Such a remedy does not touch the real evil. It still leaves the Federal Commander in Chief in the position of a benevolent adviser with no power to command. The administration of his plans is in the hands of the people over whom he has no control. The Federal Government can advise, can make general regulations, can scold and threaten to withhold the pay, but the vital function of administration, of giving the orders and seeing that they are obeyed, is in the hands of the State Governors and their subordinates. Dollars spent without the direct power to see to their application are dollars wasted."

The training prescribed is little short of preposterous for troops to be used in the first line of defense. A maximum of 48 assemblies *per annum*—none of which needs to be more than an hour and a half's duration—augmented by fifteen days' training in the field—a total of 192 hours—is virtually a drop in the bucket as compared with the amount of intensive training (about 4,000 hours) which European armies have found necessary in the present war. Even Switzerland, profiting by the experience of her neighbors, has increased the intensive training of her militia to 200 days of eight hours each, a total of sixteen hundred hours.

Congress has created for the first time a much needed reserve for the National Guard. Admirable though this innovation is, it will be almost nullified by the terms of enlistment and by the privilege granted to men in the National Guard to continue in active service during the whole enlistment period or to re-enlist if they so desire.

Congress has attempted on one hand, to improve the commissioned personnel of the National Guard by permitting the appointment of Regular officers to certain positions therein. On the other hand, it has nullified that in a large measure by permitting the commanding officers of the militia to retain their commands in cases where complete units are organized within a State, Territory or the District of Columbia.

The faulty system which caused so much trouble during the Spanish-American War is thus perpetuated. Congress, being wedded to this

faulty militia system, has made it mandatory that the command of regiments, brigades and divisions in time of war be given to militia officers, even though they be woefully inefficient. As war is the most difficult of human undertakings, officers must be thoroughly trained, and the higher their rank, the more should be exacted of them.

Your committee desires to call attention to the fact that military historians have shown that a dual voluntary sytem composed of Regulars and Militia is faulty in the extreme, because men in the absence of compulsion or other inducement will always enlist in the organization most lax in discipline—in other words, not in the Regular Army. The effect has been to make recruitment for the Regular Army next to impossible in time of war.

Congress has prescribed that both officers and men shall take a dual oath of allegiance—one to the State, the other to the Federal Government. Furthermore, it absolves a man from his enlistment contract with his State. This is nothing more or less than attacking the sacredness of contracts—a fundamental principle of all law. To serve successfully at the same time two masters is something which in human history has often been attempted but has always failed. This is what Congress now demands that the National Guard shall do, and your committee is of the opinion that the dual contract prescribed by the National Defense law cannot be condemned too severely.

In the strongest language Congress has declared that non-compliance with this Act on the part of a State shall debar its National Guard, either in whole or in part, "from receiving from the United States any pecuniary or other aid, benefit, or privilege authorized or provided by this Act or any other law." Fear of such a threat constitutes its sole force. The Federal Government is powerless to enforce its own mandate against a State which sees fit to defy it. As has been seen, the States are ordered to raise their National Guards to 800 enlisted men for every Senator and Representative in Congress. How futile to prescribe such a standard without the power to compel obedience! In short, in seeking to Federalize State troops in the face of the Constitution, Congress is attempting the impossible. Even assuming that the provisions of the present law prove acceptable, there exists no guarantee of compliance in the future by the States or their National Guard. The effort to enforce such laws as the present Act, if resisted by the States, would mean nothing less than civil war.

PART FOUR—RELATING TO PREPAREDNESS IN MATÉRIEL AND OTHER SUNDRY MATTERS

This portion of the National Defense Act contains so few defects by comparison with the other parts that they may be dismissed in a few words.

Although certain persons may have received the Medal of Honor—which can be best described as the American Victoria Cross—under circumstances not wholly justifying the bestowal of our highest deco-

ration for gallantry in action, the proposal that men who have been awarded this medal under laws in operation for more than fifty years should now be deprived of it and placed upon what amounts to a blacklist—notwithstanding that many of them are dead and, in some cases, that the Medal of Honor was buried with them or carved on their tombstones—is a retroactive measure which cannot be condemned too strongly.

It is also questionable whether the production in Government plants of nitrates for explosives and the extension of the idea to the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products is a wise measure either from an economic or legislative standpoint.

From present indications, there is every likelihood that an issue of bonds will be necessary to meet the expenditures required for national defense. Your committee is therefore at a loss to understand why the present Act resorted to bonds on the Panama Canal instead of an issue for the specific purpose of national defense.

RECAPITULATION

In spite of certain notable merits the National Defense Act does not, and cannot, provide adequate national defense. The edifice erected with such apparent care proves, when thoroughly scrutinized, to be built upon the sands. The crux of the whole question is admirably epitomized in the Report on the Organization of the Land Forces of the United States, prepared in July and August 1912, under the direction of the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, which announced the principle that **"a nation's military power is to be measured not by the total number of its male citizens capable of bearing arms but by the number of trained soldiers with which it can meet a given emergency."** The present law perpetuates the dual system, composed of a Regular Army and volunteers or militia and based upon voluntary service which we have followed in the past. This system has repeatedly broken down in the crises of our history and every other great nation has rejected it as obsolete. Under this law the only military force trained according to the standards of other nations will be the Regular Army, and once again will be demonstrated the truth of Kipling's lines:

"It's Tommy this and Tommy that,
And Tommy 'ow's your soul;
But it's thin red line of 'eroes
When the drums begin to roll."

As has been seen, the number of fighting troops in the Regular Army at its maximum war strength will be only 226,649 enlisted men. A large proportion of these fighting troops are necessarily stationed in our overseas possessions, but, even if they were all available for the defense of continental United States, the number would be so small for a nation of our rank as to be utterly ludicrous. Further-

more, under a voluntary system, the chance of obtaining this number is infinitesimally small. The 20,000 men authorized in February, 1916, have not yet been secured. Few Americans realize that the strength of armaments is not determined by the internal conditions of any given country but rather by the power of other nations which may become its enemies. Judged by this standard and by our international relations, especially under the Monroe Doctrine, to entrust our national destinies—and possibly our very national existence—to so paltry a force is nothing short of criminal folly.

The supporters of the National Guard will argue that the Regular Army does not comprise our only means of land defense because the former force is to constitute part of the first line. The answer is not far to seek. It will be found in the history of every one of our wars beginning with the Revolution, and most recently in the Report on the Mobilization of the Organized Militia and National Guard of the United States, issued by the War Department in December, 1916. On page 95 of that report is a table showing that out of 128,517 National Guardsmen inspected, only 13,440 men enlisted under the President's call of June 18, 1916, had had any previous military service, while no less than 60,299 were enlisted who had had absolutely no prior service at all. Before the call 19,202 men had a rating as marksmen and 14,802 had been given target practice, but had not attained even a marksman's rating, while no less than 56,813 had had no target practice whatsoever before they were called out by the President, and 71,505 had not attended any previous encampment or had any field service. On being mustered in 23,721 were found physically disqualified and 20,964 had served less than three months. The oath to the Federal Government was not taken by 21,884 men, 6,084 were convicted by summary court-martials, and 1,116 had deserted.

In other words, the major part of the troops constituting the first line of defense had received a ridiculously meagre training and could not shoot.

The proponents of the National Guard will argue that, insomuch as that force was called out by the President just fifteen days after the National Defense Act became a law, sufficient time was not given for the Act to have full force and effect, and that, if the National Guard were mobilized at the present time, a wholly different state of affairs would be witnessed. This threadbare argument has been advanced *ad libitum*—indeed *ad nauseum*—on every occasion since the beginning of the Revolutionary War, and in repeated instances the failure of the National Guard to come up to expectations has been followed by legislation which its supporters declared would correct every existing defect. No useful purpose would be served by enumerating here the amendments to the Dick bill of 1908 and 1910, the Dick bill of 1903, legislation with respect to the Militia at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, and so forth back to the beginning of the Revolution. Suffice to say, that not one single one of

these measures accomplished the *desideratum* and the same is true of the National Defense Act. As the report of the Executive Committee of the Mayor's Committee on National Defense of New York has so aptly pointed out (pages 34 and 35):

"A careful reading of the law gives no reason to suppose that the fundamental difficulties—the unsatisfactory recruiting, the economic distress incident to the service of men with families, the equipment muddle—would have been appreciably less serious had the National Defense Act been a year instead of a fortnight old. In principle the new National Guard legislation is the same as the old; it is built upon a divided control which now, for the second time in a generation, has proven, under test, fatal to the military effort of the Nation."

Your committee is convinced that many provisions of the National Defense Act are unconstitutional. Allusion to some of these has been made earlier in this report. A fundamental point wherein the law is unconstitutional is to be found in the endeavor to destroy the dual nature of the Militia prescribed by the Constitution and to make it, in time of national emergency, a purely Federal force—an attempt which, by its very nature must necessarily prove abortive.

In seeking to improve the condition of the National Guard, Congress has authorized expenditures for pay alone which may attain the colossal total of $75,000,000 per annum. Your Committee feels certain that this will not materially stimulate recruiting or improve the efficiency of the National Guard, and too much emphasis cannot be laid upon the fact that in this attempt Congress has unwittingly created a political-military caste which may prove a serious menace to the liberties of the people. The framers of our governmet wisely prohibited officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army from holding offices of profit and trust in the public service. Moreover, virtually every State forbids them from acquiring legal residence or domicile emanating from Service within the State. This has operated to debar officers and men of the Regular Army from exercising the right of franchise. Indeed, throughout our history we have gone to extremes to safeguard the country against the dangers of militarism springing from the possible domination of a too powerful permanent military establishment.

Furthermore, the Constitution prohibits Congress from appropriating money for the Regular Army for any period longer than two years. None of these safeguards apply to the National Guard under the present law. The officers and men of this force exercise the right of franchise, a large number of them hold offices of profit and trust under the Federal and State governments, and no limitation is placed on Congress as to the term for which appropriations for this force may be made. In a word, the effect of this legislation will be to build up a political machine which will be a veritable curse from a political standpoint, and a serious menace to military efficiency. In fact, it will render military efficiency practically impossible.

In 1912, a minority of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives made a report against Federal pay for the Militia (Report 1117, Part II., Sixty-second Congress, Third Session), from which the following declarations are quoted:

"The minority making this report is convinced that the legislation proposed by the pending bill is not only unwise, but that it is dangerous in the extreme. Rather than enter upon a legislative course that will inevitably entail upon the general Government an enormous expense, which may be found in dire emergency to have been wasted, a course that will surely lead to the creation of a great military force that will become so powerful politically that Congress will be no more able to resist its demands than it has been to resist the demands of the far less compactly organized and manageable army of pension applicants and their friends, this minority would favor a reasonable increase in the Regular Army, leaving the States to maintain their own troops in their own way and at their own expense without any aid whatever from the United States."

This minority report was signed by a certain Congressman who subsequently became, and was, the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs when the National Defense Act was discussed and passed. This sudden and complete change of attitude is difficult to explain unless it arose from pressure on the part of high ranking officers of the National Guard—as has been officially stated. Attention is called to the fact that there is abundant ground to think that the Militia provisions of the National Defense Act do not represent the opinion of the majority of the officers and men of the National Guard.

The facts enumerated above all demonstrate that any force maintained by Federal pay must be so created as to admit of no possible doubt concerning its constitutionality. It must be free from the remotest chance of interference on the part of the States—in other words, a Federal force pure and simple, owing undivided allegiance to the Federal Government alone. Under such a system—and this is the only sound military system—the National Guard, so-called, should be completely banished as a component part of our Federal army and restored to its constitutional role as a State force. Not one dollar of Federal appropriations or Federal assistance in any form should be devoted to its use.

In time of peace those States which have no constabulary will have frequent occasion to use their own militia. In time of war the maintenance of internal order is an essential function of the State forces, as our history has frequently shown. The presence of the Organized Militia within the States at such a time is imperative, and any military system which contemplates depriving the States of this protection in time of war is fundamentally wrong.

Your committee desires to point out one fact which—so far as it knows—has escaped attention wholly. By appreciating that a militia system founded upon voluntary service alone is unsound and has always, failed in crisis, and by authorizing the use of the draft in time of peace—a procedure heretofore unknown in our military history—

Congress has performed a signal service to the country in laying the foundation for universal national training and compulsory service.

The arguments of the pacifists that compulsory military service is contrary to American traditions and practice are absolutely disproved by several facts, viz.: (1) the example set by Virginia and Massachusetts in 1777, whereby men were drafted into the military service —a method recommended by Washington to the President of Pennsylvania as the only certain way of obtaining troops; (2) the system inaugurated by the Act of May 8, 1792, under which the militia—mentioned but not defined by the Constitution—was first ordered to be enrolled in districts and the members thereof to hold themselves in readiness to appear properly "armed, accoutered, and provided, when called out to exercise or into service"; (3) the recommendations made by Jefferson during his tenure of the Presidency and especially in his letter of June 19, 1813, to James Monroe*; (4) in the system of compulsory military service exacted of all able-bodied white males between the ages of 18 and 35 by the Confederacy beginning with 1862; and (5) the Enrollment Act approved March 3, 1863, better known as "the draft law," which was subequently amended by the laws of February 24, 1864, and March 3, 1865, whereby the Union resorted to obligatory military service after complete failure to secure the necessary troops by voluntary enlistment.

Guiseppe Mazzini, one of the liberators of modern Italy, very aptly declared that *"the origin of every right is in a duty fulfilled."* If, therefore, we are to be entitled to the right to demand that our Government protect our lives, liberties and property, we must fulfill our duty toward that Government, and no principle is more in keeping with a republican form of government, no doctrine is more truly democratic, than that which asserts that every able-bodied male citizen owes military service to his country. Indeed the principle of compulsory military service is no more a violation of the policy and traditions of the American people than is the payment of taxes under compulsion or compulsory education. Moreover, such a system is the sole method by which a nation can put forth its full strength in time of war. Most Americans do not apparently realize that the voluntary system is more unfair and uncertain in its results than any other military system, for the reason that it permits selfishness and shirking, and many a man is enabled to escape service just because some other man animated by greater patriotism voluntarily performs the duty which ought to be exacted of all alike. The voluntary system is inevitably attended by innumerable evils, such as too short enlist-

---

(*) "It proves more forcibly the necessity of obliging every citizen to be a soldier. This was the case with the Greeks and Romans, and must be that of every free State. Where there is no oppression there will be no pauper hirelings. We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens, and make military instruction a regular part of collegiate education. We can never be safe till this is done."

ments, bounties and other inducements to serve, the employment of raw troops, and the granting of many undeserved pensions, which entail expenditures for which there is no valid justification. History demonstrates that it invariably breaks down under the stress of war, yet Congress still persists in adhering to a most undemocratic system which experience has proved to be pernicious and which every other great nation in the world has rejected as being absolutely worthless in time of crisis.

In spite of certain admirable innovations and notwithstanding certain unquestionably good features, the National Defense Act is fundamentally unsound and contains many pernicious features--militarism lurking among those most effectually veiled. These are too high a price to pay for the benefits conferred by the Act. Unless they be stricken off the statute books immediately, it would have been far better, in the opinion of your committee, if the Act had never been written into law.

Your committee desires to emphasize one basic fact, viz.: the necessity for the reorganization of the War Department upon a business and scientific basis. This department has grown "by a process of accretion"—to use the apt expression of a French General Staff officer, who has made an exhaustive study of the military branch of our Government. Even after eighteen years of experience following the Spanish-American War, the War Department was unable to handle efficiently the mobilization of less than 200,000 Regulars and Militia on the Mexican border during the summer of 1916. Even if a miracle were witnessed in Congress giving to the land forces of the United States a perfect military organization, even if the advocates of preparedness succeed in arousing the nation to a man, all their labors will be in vain so long as the War Department is permitted to remain on its present unbusinesslike and unscientific basis.

This might well form the subject of investigation and report by a commission composed of men thoroughly conversant with the organization and working of great American corporations and of the War Offices of the leading European nations.

Your committee is convinced that there can be no proper solution of the military problem of the United States without the introduction of some system of universal training for national defense adapted to our national requirements and embracing, during the period of active service with the colors, all the able-bodied young men above eighteen but not more than twenty-three years of age—in other words, at the non-productive stage of their lives before they embark in business, professions, or other careers. This must be combined with the obligation for service, in case of national emergency, of all able-bodied men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, according to their respective capacities.

This has been the experience of all other great nations and no better proof could be adduced than their course during the present European war.

In conclusion, your committee desires to emphasize that, in any sound scheme for national defense on land, four fundamental features must be embodied, viz.:

(1) The establishment of a system of universal training for national defense and compulsory service on the broad lines just indicated.

(2) The creation of a Regular Army sufficiently large to produce, together with its trained reserves, all troops necessary for our first line of defense.

(3) The creation, through the medium of universal training for national defense and compulsory service, of additional forces to constitute our second and subsequent lines of defense.

(4) The establishment by the Federal Government of a proper military policy for national defense and the means of insuring its continuity in accordance with our system of government.

One of the essentials in securing such continuity is the creation of a Council of National Defense as an advisory body. This step has already been taken, in an imperfect way, however.

Your committee therefore urges the adoption of these fundamental principles by the Congress of Constructive Patriotism, and recommends action by the National Security League and its branches in order to secure the enactment by the Congress of the United States of the necessary legislation to carry them into effect.

Respectfully submitted,

FREDERIC L. HUIDEKOPER, Chairman.

Report of the Sub-Committee on the Navy

Your committee, after a careful examination of the naval situation, beg leave respectfully to report as follows:

The United States still continues to be the fourth naval power in ships and other material, and the fifth in number of officers and men. Thus, in sea power, we hold an exceedingly hazardous position with respect to the other great sea nations.

The Congress of 1916 authorized the construction, for 1917, of 4 Super-Dreadnaughts, 4 Battle Cruisers, 4 Scout Cruisers, 20 Destroyers, 31 Submarines, and various auxiliary vessels. Of the ships authorized for 1917 contracts for the 4 Super-Dreadnaughts were let to private yards, as were contracts for 1 Scout Cruiser, 18 Destroyers, and 29 Submarines. To Government yards were assigned 2 Destroyers, 1 Submarine, and all auxiliary vessels appropriated for. Contracts for 4 Battle Cruisers and 3 Scout Cruisers have not yet been let, owing to the Navy Department's contention that the builder's bids were too high and their specified periods of construction—for the Battle Cruisers, from 48 to 52 months—too long. Upon these points Department and builders are still in conference. The shortage of labor, as well as the present congested condition of their yards, the builders give as the causes of delay.

Admitting these unfavorable conditions, your committee is nevertheless of the opinion that, in view of the fact that two battle cruisers, of about the same size as these, were recently built on the Clyde in about eighteen months, the time asked for the completion of our own battle cruisers, viz.: from 48 to 52 months, is excessive, even if we take into consideration the fact that our shipbuilders are hampered by the eight-hour law.

To meet unwarranted delay in the delivery of material, it is our conviction that a law should be passed requiring that precedence be given to all orders for material required to expedite the completion of the naval program.

The Government's yards being chock-a-block, the Secretary has asked for an appropriation of $12,000,000 for use in enlarging the Government's yards, presumably for the purpose of constructing some of these unassigned vessels. When asked whether the completion of these vessels would be hastened were the Government yards to be enlarged, as recommended, and the vessels assigned to them, the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair stated

to the House Naval Committee that in this procedure there would be no saving of time. From his testimony and other sources of information, your Committee concludes that it would take the Government longer to build these vessels under Government conditions than it would take the private builders who have bid upon them. And this principally for the reason that the Government would first have to build the ways and shops before these ships could be laid down. Your Committee believe also, in view of experience in the past, as well as the omission of certain essential costs by Government yards, that these or any vessels will cost less if built by the civilian industry.

At this point your Committee desire to enter a protest against the methods now in vogue of figuring the cost of work done by the Navy yards. It is the opinion of your Committee that many proper charges are not entered by the yards against the cost of the work done, and that, because of this, the public is invariably misled as to the cost of vessels built in Government yards. Your Committee are of the opinion that, if a careful survey were made of this matter, it would be conclusively proven that Government work is less economical than is generally supposed, and is more costly than that done by civilian yards. In order that this vitally important question shall be cleared up and the accounting of the Government yards, particularly with respect to overhead charges, be put upon a modern basis, so that the costs of Government and civilian work can be compared with accuracy, your Committee suggest that the Government be urged to instruct the Federal Trade Commission to investigate, at once, Navy Yard cost keeping methods and recommend a system of accounting that shall be beyond dispute.

While your Committee recognizes that our Navy Yards are a great national asset, and that some of the Government's work should be done in its own yards, in order that the skilled nucleus of workmen shall at all times be maintained, and so that the Government shall not be wholly dependent upon commercial firms, they are of the opinion that it would serve the best interests of the nation, if the civilian industry were encouraged and stimulated to lay down not small, but vast yards for the quick and economical prosecution of the Government's naval work.

The Navy Yard system of construction is open to three objections. Its costs are higher than civilian costs, it involves the investment in plant of large sums of Government instead of civilian money, and it gives rise to the employment of a large political class of workmen, who are used at the polls by whichever party happens to be in power. Here it is well to point out that the basis of all sea power is a nation's ability quickly to build, equip, and man a great volume of naval tonnage.

In view of the emergency which now confronts us, your Committee earnestly recommend that steps be taken at once to place all Government work, whether it be done in private or Government yards

and shops, upon a two or a three-shift a day basis. If the current needs of commerce warrant ordinary civilian industries in running upon a two or a three-shift basis, as is the case, the urgency of the situation which confronts us assuredly warrants our practicing similar diligence in upbuilding the defenses upon which the rights and the security of our nation depend. To the claim that the labor shortage would prevent doubling up production, your Committee reply that, with proper organization and the distribution of skilled workmen among the unskilled, there would be accomplished, here and at once, such a creation of skilled labor as Great Britain brought about so shortly after the war began. Modern engineering industries, such for instance as the motor car industry, have shown that by means of standardization, specialization, the provision of skill-and-labor-saving fixtures, and intensive methods of instruction, raw labor may quickly be taught to do work of high quality. The enormous shipbuilding and munitions industries of Great Britain and France at the present day are based upon the utilization of these methods.

Before leaving this question your Committee desire to refer to the fact that the Secretary of the Navy has awarded orders for the manufacture of shells to a British concern. The award was made because the product was superior and the time and cost were less, and all recognize that the Navy Department probably felt that it was acting in an emergency. But for the future, in cases where the product comes up to naval requirements, we think that it would be an injustice to require an American concern to work upon the basis of an eight-hour day and bid accordingly, and then award the work upon which the American concern has bid to a lower, foreign bidder, whose workday may be as long as he chooses to make it.

In this matter your Committee are of the opinion that, even though American work costs more—as your Committee believe it does and should, owing to the better living conditions with which we have surrounded our workmen—it is imperative that all work upon our machinery of defense, whether it relate to ships, guns or other material, should be done by our own people and no other, in order that Americans not only shall acquire the high skill necessary to the production of the delicate instrumentalities which are now employed in warfare, but be encouraged to adapt their plants and direct their ingenuity to the manufacture, upon a sufficiently large scale, of everything needed by the country in the event of war. Obviously, it is essential that America shall be able to produce her own war material, and thus be independent for her defense of any other nation. If we depend even upon one other nation, it may be that nation with which we shall find ourselves at war. Your Committee believe, however, that the Department should rigidly maintain the highest achievable standards of excellence, and require the civilian industry to meet those requirements in all work done for the Government.

We therefore recommend that the National Security League oppose the award of any munition work to foreign manufacturers, except, as in the present case, under emergency conditions.

Returning to the matter of ships, your Committee are of the opinion that the three-year program which has been adopted by Congress is insufficient to restore us to a position of safety, and that it is badly out of balance in several respects. This is a matter which should be dealt with at once. In the matter of balance, for instance, but 10 Scout Cruisers have been provided for—4 to be laid down in 1917, 3 in 1918, and 3 in 1919. These, together with the 3 slow Scout Cruisers which we now possess will be a wholly insufficient number, as has been shown by the present war. In Scout Cruisers in 1914 Great Britain, Germany and Japan were far better equipped than we, while these nations have since greatly increased their numbers of these ships, as well as those of all other types. Your Committee therefore recommend that 25 Scout Cruisers, like those already appropriated for, be immediately added to those already authorized, and that these be laid down in 1918.

Of Destroyers built and building in 1914 Great Britain had 188, Germany 154, and Japan 52, while the United States had 70. The belligerent nations have since increased their Destroyer flotillas enormously. For our three-year program but 50 Destroyers have been authorized; 20 to be laid down in 1917, 15 in 1918, and 15 in 1919. Your Committee recommend that 75 additional Destroyers be authorized at once—50 of them to be laid down in 1918, and 25 in 1919.

Your Committee call especial attention to the fact that the small craft of the Navy, especially its Destroyers and Submarines, lend themselves to manufacture inland, at points, for instance, along the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Were these districts assured a continuous supply of work of this nature, your Committee believe civilian capital could immediately be induced to lay down therein all of the necessary facilities. The pursuit of such a policy would have the additional advantages of creating inland a class of skilled shipbuilders, and of giving sections of the country remote from the sea a stake in the Navy.

Concerning Submarines. Your Committee are not aware of the exact numbers of these craft at any time possessed by Great Britain, Germany or Japan. Of these vessels, 50 Coast Submarines, of about 500 tons displacement, were authorized in the three-year program, and 9 Fleet, or Sea-Going, Submarines. Your Committee are of the opinion that in future no Submarines should be built which are unable to keep the sea in all weathers and to cruise for great distances in company with the fleet. It should not be overlooked that the Submarine is a naval weapon and as such its primary duty should be to operate with the fleet. This duty cannot be performed efficiently as experience shows by a vessel of less than 800 tons displacement. The experience of the present war has taught us that the Submarine to be successful must be a long-distance, deep-water craft, and it is

not possible to secure these qualities in a craft with the small displacement which has been given the 58 Submarines already authorized. In view of the foregoing your Committee are of the opinion that no further Coast Submarines should be authorized, but that 40 additional Fleet, or Sea-Going, Submarines of suitable tonnage should be authorized and built at once.

Of auxiliaries the three-year program provides but 3 Fuel Ships, 1 Repair Ship, 1 Transport, and 1 Hospital Ship; 2 Destroyer Tenders, 1 Submarine Tender, 2 Ammunition Ships, and 2 Gunboats. Your Committee are of the opinion that the numbers of these auxiliaries should immediately be increased in proper proportion.

Before leaving the subject of ships your Committee wish to express their conviction that the present program is not only badly short of Scout Cruisers, Destroyers, and Sea-Going Submarines, but of capital ships as well, that is of Super-Dreadnaughts and Battle Cruisers. They are of the opinion that all of the capital ships of the three-year program should be laid down at once. The unlooked for delay in building, which has arisen, makes this imperative. Furthermore, your Committee believe that henceforth no capital ship should be authorized having less displacement than the greatest the Canal will accommodate. Your Committee would like to go on record as holding the opinion that the Panama Canal will not necessarily set the limit to the size of ships. The office of the Canal is merely to abbreviate the time required to go from one ocean to the other, and this ability to shorten the time will become less important as the number of all vessels, naval and commercial, on the Pacific increases, and the need arises for an independent United States naval force in each ocean.

In making the foregoing recommendations your Committee are not unaware of the shortage of shipbuilding facilities from which the country is now so severely suffering. On the contrary, they are so sensitive to this shortage, and so exercised over the disastrous possibilities which may result if an enormous enlargement of these facilities is not provided at once, that they believe it to be their duty to suggest to the Government and the nation a viewpoint wholly different from that from which the Government and nation heretofore have regarded this vital matter. Your Committee therefore respectfully lay down the principle that whereas we are now permitting the size of our Navy, and the extent of our sea power, to be limited by the meager ship-building facilities which we now possess, we should instead immediately reverse this policy and fit our shipbuilding facilities to the naval needs of the nation. This principle being unassailable, your Committee recommend that the National Congress immediately take such steps as shall make it profitable for the civilian industry to lay down and equip at once ample yards and other facilities for the production, not only of the ships already authorized, but of the additions which we recommend herein.

Solution of merchant marine. Your Committee are convinced that

unless the present friction which exists between the Navy Department and the civilian shipbuilding industry be removed, and the industry be encouraged to lay down vastly greater facilities than those at present existing, and unless such an increase in the Navy be made, in ships, officers, and men, as we suggest, our country eventually will be compelled to pay in defeat such a staggering price, as shall make the cost of the projects recommended by your Committee sink into negligible insignificance.

The Committee now turn to the Air Service with the observation that the Navy is further behind in air service than in any other branch. In this new field more can be accomplished in a given time and for a given sum of money than by doing any other one thing. The mastery of the air, overland and oversea, has proven abroad of such supreme value that in the air service the world is now in sight of a third naval-military arm, which should be wholly independent of either existing arm. Air power we believe is destined to play perhaps as great a part in the wars of the future as sea power. Air power, however, being analogous to sea power, your Committee believe should be developed principally through naval channels. Therefore we recommend that in addition to the shipbuilding facilities which we have already recommended, the National Congress be asked to induce civilians to supply large and suitable facilities for constructing aircraft. In view of the foregoing your Committee recommend that the too modest aeronautical appropriation which the Navy Department has asked of the present Congress be doubled, and that the Department be given a free hand in the expenditure of its aircraft appropriation.

We now come to what is the most serious problem with which the Navy is confronted; that of a deplorable shortage of officers and men. Without a sufficiently numerous and highly skilled personnel a Navy, however good its matériel, it bound to fail of its purpose in action. In 1914 the personnel of the British navy consisted of 150,609 men, with 65,065 reserves; that of the German navy was 79,197 men, with 82,400 reserves, and that of the Japanese navy, 55,736 men, with 30,550 reserves. Since 1914 the personnel of these navies has been enormously increased. In the same year the personnel of the American navy was but 57,019 men, with no reserves. It takes from seven to fifteen years to make a naval officer, even of subordinate rank, and from three to ten years to make a competent bluejacket. Our naval militia is but a small body of civilians who have had little training, while we are without a merchant marine from which to recruit, in time of need, even raw material.

The Congress of 1916 authorized an increase of officers and men, but an increase which your Committee believe was far below the actual requirements of the service. The Navy at present is short of the small increased personnel then authorized by 1,100 officers and just under 26,000 men. There are now out of full commission 13 Battleships, 21 Cruisers, 32 Destroyers, and various other craft, while

it is believed that only a few, if any, of the vessels which are in commission have aboard them their full complements. This shortage of officers is an exceedingly grave matter, for officers are a product of years of training which is to be got nowhere but at Annapolis, and aboard naval ships. By 1921 the net increase by graduation from Annapolis will be about 900 officers. But to fully man the ships authorized in 1916 alone will require, it is estimated, 1,467 officers. If to this be added the 364 officers required for the ships previously under construction, but not yet finished, and the 400 officers necessary to put dead ships into commission, your Committee believe that by the year 1921 there will be required 2,300 additional officers. To meet this demand there will be available only the 900 young officers, which will have been graduated from Annapolis between 1917 and 1921, and this will leave a shortage of no less than 1,331 officers. In these figures neither the needs of the new and rapidly growing aerial service have been considered nor of such additional ships as have been recommended herein. It will be seen therefore that in this vital particular we are confronted with a critical situation.

To meet this situation the present Chief of the Bureau of Navigation has suggested that the course at Annapolis be shortened temporarily from four to three years, the first-class men being sent afloat immediately. This, however, fails to touch even the fringe of the situation, which in the opinion of your Committee requires the most prompt and drastic action if we are to maintain our present position as a sea power, much less regain the position we have lost.

This shortage of officers, it will be borne in mind, is an evil which cannot be remedied by the gathering of men from any existing industry or institution of learning except that of the Government, at Annapolis. Therefore, it must be met promptly and with sufficient completeness by the Government itself.

In order to meet this situation adequately your Committee recommend that the quadrupling of the present establishment at Annapolis be undertaken at once, the number of midshipmen be raised to fourfold their present number, and, pending the construction of adequate buildings at Annapolis, that buildings be found in the neighborhood, or temporary structures be there erected for the purpose of housing and instructing the new men who must at once be taken in hand for training. Your Committee is convinced that unless such a radical enlargement of our facilities for producing officers be begun immediately, we shall be wholly unable properly to work or fight, even the ships which are already authorized, to say nothing of the additional ships which it is imperative to build.

A similar enlargement of the scope of our plans must be made with respect to the getting of enlisted men, so that we shall be able not only to fully officer and man all of the ships that we have, but each new one as soon as it is completed.

This brings us to our final recommendation, which concerns the securing of officers and men for the Navy, as well as for the Army.

Your Committee refer to universal training and service for young men, and hereby emphatically express their opinions that, under no other system, can either the quality or the number of young men be got, which the highly technical service of the Navy requires.

In view of the fact that the needs of the Navy, our first line of defense, are no less in this respect than the needs of the Army, your Committee in conclusion urge that universal training and service for young men be adopted at once, and that, in such legislation as Congress shall enact for the purpose, proper provision be made for the requirements of the Navy.

J. BERNARD WALKER, Chairman.
HENRY A. WISE WOOD,
RAYMOND B. PRICE,
HERBERT L. SATTERLEE.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Universal Military Training and Service

---

Washington, D. C., January 25, 1917.

Capt. Herbert Barry called the meeting to order and Mr. George Wharton Pepper of Philadelphia, was appointed chairman.

Mr. Harding of New York, moved that the chairman appoint a committee of seven to formulate the general principles which should underlie any legislation for universal training and service and report back as soon as possible.

The motion was seconded and after some discussion, in which many participated, was carried.

The Chairman appointed Messrs. Edward Harding, of New York, Chairman; General Maxwell Van Zandt Woodhull, of Washington, D. C.; Grenville Clark, of New York; George Wentworth Carr, of Philadelphia; Herbert Barry, of New York; Randall J. Le Boeuf, of Albany, and George Hewitt Myers, of Washington, D. C.

Major Abel Davis, of Illinois, First Illinois Infantry, spoke at length, referring to Gen. Scott's report that to be prepared to meet the most powerful foe requires two years' service; army of citizens not to be paid.

Mr. Lloyd Taylor of New York asked how long it takes in England to train their men. Major Davis answered that it took eleven months and added that the British would give more time except for the exigencies of the service.

Commodore Jacob G. Miller of New York, spoke in regard to necessity for efficiency.

Mr. Sprigg, of New Jersey, read some remarks. Mr. William A. Pike, of Pennsylvania, favored a "commission" to study adequate national preparedness including business.

Mr. Harding, Chairman, presented the committee report, as follows:

> The committee of seven appointed to formulate the principles which should underlie any legislation for universal military or

naval training and service, recommends the passage of the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That it is recommented that the Patriotic and Defense Organizations here represented support the passage of Federal legislation based on the following general principles:

1. Military or Naval training for all physically fit young men prior to the age of 21 and preferably in the 19th year.

2. The training to be intensive, continuous field or sea training for the period necessary to produce an efficient soldier or sailor.

3. The system to be under exclusive Federal control.

4. No pay to be given men when being trained.

5. Obligation to serve in war as well as to train in time of peace.

(Signed) EDWARD HARDING, Chairman.
HERBERT BARRY,
RANDALL J. LE BQEUF,
GEORGE WENTWORTH CARR,
GRENVILLE CLARK,
GEORGE HEWITT MYERS.

Gen. Woodhull dissented in a verbal opinion.

Mr. Arthur H. Dusenberry, White Plains, N. Y., thought the report should cover industrial preparedness.

Major J. W. Loveland, of New Jersey, moved to amend page 2 by adding to it "details as recommended by General Staff, Army, and General Board, Navy."

The motion being put whether the amendment should be carried, it was declared lost by a vote of 22 to 17.

Major Davis opposed having the report adopted, as he declared it was too indefinite. Judge Le Boeuf spoke in favor of adopting the report. Others spoke briefly both for and against it. A woman delegate from Washington, D. C., representing the Daughters of the War of 1812, wished to know what women should do to help while the men were fighting in the ranks. The National President of the Daughters of National Preparedness Association reported upon the work of that organization.

After some further discussion on motion being duly made and seconded the report of the committee of seven was adopted.

Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., moved that the committee be continued as a standing committee with power to increase its membership and with further power to confer with other committees existing, representing other organizations in order to co-ordinate the action of all organizations who favor the general principles of Universal Military Training and Service. This motion was carried unanimously.

A motion was made to endorse the report of the chief of staff, and, after being seconded, was withdrawn.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

ARTHUR F. COSBY,

Secretary.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Governmental and Individual Efficiency

The Committee called to order by the chairman in room 128, New Willard Hotel, 1:00 P. M., January 26th.

Present:

Chas. Ashley, Toledo, Ohio
I. L. Graves, Knoxville, Tenn.
Oliver T. Keep, Rutherford, N. J.
G. I. Rockwood, Worcester, Mass.
E. G. Scott, Ludlow, Mass.
John A. Switzer, Knoxville, Tenn.
Gardner S. Williams, Ann Arbor, Mich.

I. L. Graves, Knoxville, Tenn., was asked to act as secretary.

Preliminary draft of proposed resolution was submitted to the committee by the chairman. This draft was thoroughly considered and the following resolution agreed upon to be offered to the Congress:

WHEREAS, The war in Europe has revealed and developed a marvelous mastery of industrial, financial, military and other resources, and

WHEREAS, The fundamental reason for that remarkable effectiveness of the European nations lies in the fact that they have fully developed policies and organizations which look to the training, service and welfare of the whole people, the encouragement of scientific investigation of public questions, and the acceptance of trained and well-equipped public leadership, Be it therefore

RESOLVED: (1) That while we do not abate our devotion to the principles of liberty on which this government was founded—freedom of speech, of the press, and of religious worship, as well as the right of the people to alter their government—we commend to the American nation the imperative need for taking immediately into serious consideration those ideals of governmental service, public training and co-operation, which European countries have found essential to strengthening the loyalty and solidarity of their citizenship.

(2) That we recommend consideration of measures which will provide a leadership responsible to the electorate through the development

of a greater publicity and freer criticism and of methods of transferring power to other leaders whenever a majority shall demand it. The foregoing measures presuppose other measures which will give greater power to governmental executives through positive provision for leadership,

(3) That to provide an effective means of planning and executing government work we recommend an efficient civil service and the adoption of a "budget system,"

(4) That we repudiate the idea that it is possible for the government to be strong and efficient for national defense and at the same time weak and inefficient in rendering the common services needed to protect the health, promote the comfort and serve the convenience of its citizens,

(5) That the fullest faith in the democratic ideals of our nation we commend to the most serious attention of the American people such studies of our institutions as may be expected to result in an adjustment of the mechanism of politics and administration to the requirements of the present day.

It was the sense of the committee that this resolution be accompanied by a brief explanatory address, and, on motion, Messrs. Cleveland, Williams and Keep were chosen a sub-committee to prepare the formal report and address to be included in the permanent records of the Congress.

On motion, Prof. Williams was appointed by the chairman to present to the Congress while in session at Washington, the resolution as adopted.

Prof. John A. Switzer, of Knoxville, Tenn., offered the following resolution in connection with the so-called Tavenner Bill:

WHEREAS, The Army and Navy Bill passed by the present Congress contains a provision looking toward industrial preparedness of the country through the agency of granting small contracts for munitions to manufacturing plants throughout the land, and to that end has authorized the secretaries of the Army and Navy to let contracts in conformity with this provision; and

WHEREAS, The Tavenner Bill, also passed by the present Congress, provides among other things not only that efficiency methods of production and management shall be prohibited in the government arsenals, but as well in all those privately owned plants which accept any government contract for munitions, not alone in the handling of said contract, but in the entire conduct of their private manufacturing business, and

WHEREAS, This provision of the Tavenner Bill has been found in actual practice to utterly defeat the purpose and spirit of the aforementioned provision of the Army and Navy Bill and thereby acts in a manner adverse to the welfare and safety of the country,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the committee on governmental and individual efficiency hereby requests the committee of Army and Navy to frame among its resolutions a vigorous protest against the operations of the Tavenner Bill, basing the same upon grounds of patriotism only.

On motion this resolution was referred to the Committee on the Army and Navy of the Congress, with recommendation that it be favorably considered.

On motion the chairman was requested to call together the subcommittee for the drafting of a report and address, at such time and place as best suited the convenience of the members.

The committee then adjourned.

F. A. CLEVELAND, Chairman.
I. L. GRAVES, Secretary.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Woman's Part in Preparedness

At the invitation of the National Security League, Miss Grace Parker presented a plan for the co-ordination and development of the woman power of the United States at the Congress of Constructive Patriotism in Washington on January 26, 1917.

At the conclusion of Miss Parker's address, a special session of women interested in the principles involved was held at the New Willard Hotel. The meeting was called to order by Mr. S. Stanwood Menken, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Security League. Mr. Menken asked Miss Maude Wetmore, of Rhode Island, to act as Chairman of the meeting.

Miss Wetmore took the chair and, as there was no objection, appointed Miss Powell, of New York, to act as Secretary.

The Chairman, after a few introductory remarks, asked Miss Parker to outline the proposed organization, the program of which was the outcome of her survey and study of the conditions prevailing in England—both in relation to what service is demanded of women and how women have organized to meet the service.

At the close of Miss Parker's talk, the following resolution was moved and seconded:

Resolved:

> That it is the sense of this meeting that the Chair be empowered to appoint a Committee of at least fifteen members from various States; that the Chair shall be a member of this Committee; that the Committee be empowered to elect its own Chairman, an Executive Committee to facilitate its labors; that it be empowered to add to its members when wishing so to do, and that it be given full power to make a thorough investigation and to form a national organization.

There was a general discussion, many women from various parts of the country endorsing the plan and pledging support. The resolution was unanimously carried.

The Chair announced that the fifteen members of the Organization Committee would be immediately appointed and would report at the earliest moment.

It was the understanding of the Committee at that time that the plan, in its detail, would require from four to five months for its completion.

At a subsequent meeting held in Washington at the Hotel Shoreham on Saturday, January 27th, the Organization Committee was formed, consisting of:

Miss Maude Wetmore—Rhode Island
Mrs. Willis Martin—Pennsylvania
Mrs. Barrett Wendell—Massachusetts
Mrs. C. A. Severance—Minnesota
Mrs. Hugh L. Scott—D. C.
Mrs. Edward R. Hewitt—New Jersey
Mrs. Lewis B. Stillwell—New Jersey
Mrs. F. V. Hammar—Missouri
Mrs. Lindsay Patterson—North Carolina
Mrs. William W. Sale—Virginia
Miss Anne Morgan—New York
Mrs. Charles F. Edson—California
Mrs. Thomas Owen—Alabama
Mrs. George Hoadley—Ohio
Mrs. George S. Isham—Illinois
Mrs. Coffin Van Rensselaer—New York
Mrs. William C. Story—New York
Miss Grace Parker—New York

Miss Maude Wetmore was elected Temporary Chairman. The organization of the National League for Woman's Service is the result of the initial meeting at the Congress of Constructive Patriotism. The headquarters of this league is at 38 West 39th Street, New York City. The officers are Miss Maude Wetmore, Chairman; Miss Anne Morgan, Treasurer; Miss Grace Parker, National Commandant.

Sub-Committees

PATRIOTISM THROUGH EDUCATION

Mathew P. Adams, Mooseheart, Illinois.
Dean Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. J. H. Apple, President of Hood College, Frederick, Md.
Max W. Ball, Washington, D. C.
Edwin J. Bartlett, Professor, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Arthur E. Bestor, President Chautauqua Institute, Chautauqua, N. Y
Ben. Blewett, Superintendent Board of Education, St. Louis, Mo.
Elmer Jared Bliss, President Regal Shoe Co., Boston, Mass.
O. J. Bond, The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina.
Rodney H. Brandon, Mooseheart, Illinois.
Frank H. Briggs, Marshall U. S. Court of Customs Appeals, Washington, D. C.
Porter Emerson Browns, Norwalk, Connecticut.
Prof. Harry Edwin Burton, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
J. M. Callahan, Morgantown, West Virginia.
Theodore C. Cazeau, Assistant Superintendent of Mails, U. S. Post Office, Rochester, N. Y.
J. A. C. Chandler, Richmond, Va.
Walter E. Clark, College City of New York, New York City.
Dr. C. Ward Crampton, Director Physical Training, New York City.
Frederick W. Dallinger, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
F. M. Davenport, Clinton, N. Y.
James J. Davis, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Thomas C. Desmond, New York City.
C. H. Dickson, Kensington, Maryland.
Arthur N. Dusenbury, Secretary of the National Security League, White Plains, New York.
Samuel T. Dutton, New York City.
Horace Ellis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Prof. Henry W. Farnam, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
E. A. Fay, Washington ,D. C.
Dr. Thomas Fell, Provost of the University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland.
E. D. Fite, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York.
George B. Frankforter, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Prof. Franklin H. Giddings, Columbia University, New York City.
Gordon Gordon, Flushing, N. Y.
Herbert R. Gurney, Treasurer of Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Wallace E. Hackett, Harrisburg, Pa.
Hermann Hagedorn, Jr., Fairfield, Connecticut.
Rt. Rev. John W. Hamilton, Chancellor, The American University, Washington, D. C.
A. R. Hanon, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard University, Boston, Mass.
Carl Hayden, Phoenix, Arizona.

Dr. Amy Hewes, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts.
Dr. David Jayne Hill, Washington, D. C.
A. N. Holcombe, Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Horace Holden, Associate Headmaster, Westminster School, Simsbury, Connecticut.
Thomas N. Hoover, Professor, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Archibald Hopkins, Washington, D. C.
Thomas B. Jackson, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
Allen Johnson, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
R. O. Jones, Washington, D. C.
Francis T. A. Junkin, Doctor, Chicago, Ill.
Miss Frances A. Kellor, New York City.
A. M. Langford, Principal Allegheny County Academy, Cumberland, Md.
John J. Lentz, Columbus, Ohio.
Chancellor S. B. McCormack, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Grenville S. MacFarland, Editor of Boston American, Boston, Mass.
Oscar C. Merrill, Chevy Chase, Maryland.
Dr. S. E. Mezes, President College of City of New York.
Thomas F. Moran, Professor Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Guy Murchie, Boston, Massachusetts.
Miss Mary M. North, Herndon, Virginia.
Dr. Edwn W. Pahlow, Lawrencevlle School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Dr. William F. Pierce, President Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.
Mrs. G. M. Pinckney, Washington, D. C.
Raymond B. Price, New York City.
Major George Haven Putnam, New York City.
E. E. Randolph, Elon College, Elon, North Carolina.
Mrs. E. E. Randolph, Elon College, Elon, North Carolina.
Prof. Joseph E. Raycroft, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Ira L. Reeves, Northfield, Vermont.
Calvin W. Rice, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York City.
Oliver C. Ricketson, Pittsburgh, Pa.
George I. Rockwood, Worcester, Massachusetts.
Paul Saurel, Professor, College of City of New York.
E. Swartz, Principal Army and Navy Preparatory School, Washington, D. C.
H. L. Shantz, Washington, D. C.
William Sloane, New York City.
Albion W. Small, Dean University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
O. M. W. Sprague, Professor Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
R. C. Stearns, Superintendent Public Instruction, Richmond, Virginia.
J. A. Switzer, Professor University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
Rev. Chas. P. Taylor, Greenwich, Conn.
H. W. Temple, Washington, D. C.
Chas. H. Tibbits, White Plains, N. Y.
E. H. Vickers, Professor University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.
August H. Vogel, Milwaukee, Wis.
Dr. E. D. Warfield, President Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
E. H. Wells, The American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.
Barrett Wendall, Professor Emeritus, Harvard University.
W. F. Willoughby, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Frederick Winsor, Middlesex School, Concord, Massachusetts.
William M. Wood, President American Woolen Co., Boston, Mass.

ARMY.

Herbert Barry, New York City.
George M. Brown, St. Louis, Mo.
W. A. Cable, New York City.
Percy H. Clark, Philadelphia, Pa.
Capt. Arthur F. Cosby, Military Training Camp Association, New York City.
Charles T. Gresswell, Philadelphia, Pa.
William N. Dykman, New York City.
S. Edson Gage, New York City.
General Francis V. Greene, New York City.
Capt. M. E. Hanna, Stamford, Conn.
Gen. George H. Harries, Omaha, Nebraska.
Evan Hollister, Buffalo, New York.
J. L. Lockwood, White Plains, New York.
Gen. E. W. Nichols, Superintendent Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.
Col. L. D. Tyson, Knoxville, Tenn.
J. Mayhew Wainwright, New York City.
Major William H. Wiley, New York City.
Gen. George W. Wingate, New York City.
Lafayette Young, Des Moines, Iowa.

NAVY.

Andrew Hussey Allen, Washington, D. C.
Charles J. Bonaparte, Baltimore, Md.
George T. Buckingham, Chicago, Ill.
A. B. Lambert, St. Louis, Mo.
H. B. Lindsay, Knoxville, Tenn.
George von L. Meyer, Boston, Mass.
Franklin T. Miller, New York City.
Newbold Morris, New York City.
Henry Reuterdahl, Weehawken, N. J.
Herbert L. Satterlee, New York City.
W. R. Whitney, Schenectady, N. Y.
Beekman Winthrop, New York City.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE.

Frank Frost Abbott, Princeton, N. J.
W. I. Lincoln Adams, Montclair, N. J.
Herbert Barry, New York City.
Karl H. Behr, New York City.
Col. C. A. Benscoter, Knoxville, Tenn.
O. J. Bond, Superintendent, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
Robert S. Bradley, Boston, Mass.
Col. Oliver B. Bridgman, New York City.
Col. Franklin Q. Brown, New York City.
George Wentworth Carr, Philadelphia, Pa.
Col. W. C. Church, New York City.
Grenville Clark, New York City
Gen. Charles H. Cole, Boston, Mass.
C. R. Corning, New York City.
George Crompton, Worcester, Mass.
Hon. Grafton D. Cushing, Boston, Mass.
Grant Curry, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Frank Depew, New York City.
Joseph Dilworth, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. H. Eldredge, Real Estate, Boston, Mass.

Thomas Evans, Philadelphia, Pa.
A. Rex Flinn, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Walton A. Green, Editor of Boston Journal, Boston, Mass.
Howard H. Gross, Universal Military Training League, Chicago, Ill.
C. Willing Hare, New York City.
Maj. Thorndike Howe, Lawrence, Mass.
A. C. James, New York City
Hennen Jennings, Washington, D. C.
Hon. T. L. Kirkpatrick, Mayor of Charlotte, N. C.
Theodore T. Lane, Flushing, N. Y.
Almet R. Latson, New York City.
Alexander Laughlin, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Randall J. LeBoeuf, Albany, N. Y.
Albert J. Logan, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Edwin K. Love, St. Louis, Mo.
Maj. John Winthrop Loveland, Englewood, N. J.
Frank Maloney, Knoxville, Tenn.
William L. Marbury, Baltimore, Md.
Joseph H. Mead, White Plains, N. Y.
C. B. Mehard, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Ralph D. Mershon, New York City.
Wm. Fellowes Morgan, New York City.
William Muldoon, New York.
Hon. Andrew J. Peters, Boston, Mass.
Edwin Parkinson, Montpelier, Ohio.
Brig. Gen. F. H. Phillips, Jr., National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, Washington, D. C.
Frank H. Platt, New York City.
Harry H. Polk, Des Moines, Iowa.
William A. Purrington, New York City.
W. E. Remington, New York City.
Capt. Wm. E. Remick, Cambridge, Mass.
Bernard J. Rothwell, Boston, Mass.
Robert Saltonstall, Boston, Mass.
Lloyd Taylor, New York City.
Henry Theobald, Toledo, Ohio.
General William Verbeck, Manlius, N. Y.
Col. W. J. White, Governor National Military Home, Dayton, Ohio.
Gen. Maxwell Van Zandt Woodhull, Washington, D. C.

GOVERNMENTAL AND INDIVIDUAL EFFICIENCY

U. N. Bethell, President New York Telephone Company, New York City.
James G. Cutler, Rochester,N. Y.
R. Bayard Cutting, New York City.
Charles L. Dering, Chicago, Ill.
Matthew S. Dwyer, Providence, R. I.
Hon. D. A. Garber, Mayor of Ridgewood, N. J.
J. L. Graves, Knoxville, Tenn.
Mrs. Borden Harriman, Washington, D. C.
S. Gale Lowrie, Municipal Reference Bureau, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. T. Meredith, Successful Farming, Des Moines, Ia.
W. B. Munro, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Hon. Chas. Nagel, St. Louis, Mo.
Arthur W. Page, Garden City, L. I., N. Y.
Herbert Quick, Federal Farm Loan Bureau, Treasury Dept., Washington, D. C.
Edgar G. Scott, Ludlow, Mass.

Leslie M. Shaw, New York City.
Thomas K. Skinker, St. Louis, Mo.
Henry Stockbridge, Justice Court of Appeals, Baltimore, Maryland.
L. D. Upson, Director Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Detroit, Mich.
Harvey W. Wiley, M.D., Washington, D. C.
Gardner S. Williams, Ann Arbor, Mich.
W. F. Willoughby, Institute for Government Research, Washington, D. C.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

John Barrett, Director Pan American Union, Washington, D. C.
James M. Beck, New York City.
George Louis Beer, New York City.
Robert M. Boyd, Jr., Montclair, N. J.
Ira H. Brainerd, New York City.
William Marshall Bullitt, Louisville, Ky.
Henry H. Chamberlin, Worcester, Mass.
Frederic R. Coudert, 32 Rector St., New York City.
Donald Dey, Syracuse, N. Y.
Lloyd C. Griscom, New York City.
William Gardner Hale, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Charles Hathaway, New York City.
David J. Hill, Washington, D. C.
George Kennan, New York City.
Sinclair Kennedy, Brookline, Mass.
Theodore Marburg, Baltimore, Md.
Morton Prince, Boston, Mass.
G. H. Putnam, New York City.
Henry W. Sprague, Buffalo, N. Y.
Hugh M. Tate, Knoxville, Tenn.
Henry White, New York City.
Henry L. Wilson, Indianapolis, Ind.

AMERICANIZATION

Commissioner John Price Jackson, Dept. of Labor and Industry, Harrisburg, Pa.
John S. Lawrence, Boston, Mass.
Wm. Loeb, Jr., New York City.
Edwin A. Rumball, Buffalo, N. Y.
H. H. Wheaton, Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.

WOMAN'S PART IN THE PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

Mrs. Charles I. Backus, New York City.
Mrs. Charles Sumner Bird, East Walpole, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York City.
Mrs. Wilfred DePuy, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Miss Margaret Fisher, New Haven, Conn.
Mrs. Gordon Gordon, Flushing, N. Y.
Mrs. Wm. G. McKnight, New York City.
Mrs. W. E. D. Scott, Greenwich, Conn.
Mrs. J. Montgomery Sears, Southboro, Mass.

Delegates

APPOINTED BY GOVERNORS

By Hon. George A. Carlson, Governor of Colorado

Rt. Rev. F. J. McConnell, Denver
Lawrence C. Phipps, Denver
Hon. Albert A. Reed, Denver

By Hon. Marcus H. Holcomb, Governor of Connecticut

Rev. J. J. McCook, Hartford
Henry Ferguson, LL.D., Hartford
Hon. Albert McC. Mathewson, New Haven
Clement C. Hyde, Hartford

By Hon. Charles R. Miller, Governor of Delaware

Col. Geo. A. Elliott, Wilmington
Gen. Chas. D. Bird, Wilmington
Dr. Samuel Chiles Mitchell, Newark

By Hon. Edward F. Dunne, Governor of Illinois

Gen. F. S. Dickson, Springfield, Ill.
Col. Jacob Frank, Chicago
Major R. .R. McCormick, Chicago

By Hon. G. W. Clarke, Governor of Iowa

Hon. Lafayette Young, Des Moines
Hon. Emmett Tinley, Council Bluffs
Col. Nathaniel French, Davenport

By Hon. A. O. Stanley, Governor of Kentucky

Hon. Robert Rodes, Bowling Green
Hon. Charles K. Wheeler, Paducah
Hon. Claude Walker, Hickman
Hon. W. T. Tandy, Hopkinsville
Hon. C. W. Bransford, Owensboro

By Hon. R. G. Pleasant, Governor of Louisiana

Hon. W. O. Hart, New Orleans
Hon. Frank Roberts, Lake Charles
Hon. John R. Thornton, Alexandria

By Hon. Emerson C. Harrington, Governor of Maryland

Hon. Edwin Warfield, Baltimore
Francis N. Jencks, Baltimore
Henry W. Williams, Baltimore

By Hon. Samuel W. McCall, Governor of Massachusetts

John L. Saltonstall, Boston
Walton A. Greene, Boston
George S. Mumford, Boston
Frederic Winthrop, Boston
Godfrey Cabot, Boston
Hon. Eben S. Draper, Hopedale

By Hon. Woodbridge N. Ferris, Governor of Michigan

Edwin F. Sweet, Washington, D. C.
Frank E. Doremus, Detroit
Samuel W. Beakes, Ann Arbor

By Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo, Governor of Mississippi

Hon. N. M. Everett, Hickory
Hon. F. R. Birdsall, Yazoo City
Hon. Will Noah, Kosciusko
Hon. A. C. Anderson, Ripley
Hon. A. F. Herman, Pontotoc
Hon. C. E. Cunningham, Newton
Hon. J. J. Haynie, Quitman
Hon. Paul Hobbs, Brookhaven
Hon. R. T. Quinn, Magnolia
Hon. Joseph E. Norwood, Magnolia
Hon. E. A. Fitzgerald, Vicksburg
Hon. J. T. Mayhew, Clarksdale

By Hon. Emmet D. Boyle, Governor of Nevada

Hon. Francis G. Newlands, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Key Pittman, Washington, D. C.
Hon. E. E. Roberts, Washington, D. C.

By Hon. William C. McDonald, Governor of New Mexico

Hon. A. A. Jones, East Las Vegas
Hon. T. B. Catron, Santa Fe
Hon. N. B. Field, Albuquerque

By Hon. Charles S. Whitman, Governor of New York

W. C. Arkell, Canajoharie
U. N. Bethell, New York City
Judge Herbert P. Bissell, Buffalo
Chas. H. Bissikummer, Albany
Franklin Q. Brown, New York City
Wm. M. Calder, Brooklyn
James H. Callahan, Schenectady
Lewis S. Chanler, New York City
Eversley Childs, New York City
Alphonso T. Clearwater, Kingston
George H. Cobb, Watertown
Thos. F. Conway, Plattsburg
George B. Cortelyou, Riverdale
James Goold Cutler, Rochester
J. Francis Day, Utica
Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York City
Hiram H. Edgerton, Rochester
Dr. John Huston Finley, Albany
Louis P. Fuhrman, Buffalo
Elbert H. Gary, New York City
Martin H. Glynn, New York City
Simon Guggenheim, New York City
John Hays Hammond, New York City
Mrs. E. H. Harriman, New York City
William Hayward, New York City
A. Barton Hepburn, New York City
David Jayne Hill, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Geo. P. Hilton, Albany
Chas. Bulkley Hubbell, New York City
Francis M. Hugo, Watertown
Frank Irvine, Ithaca
Arthur Curtiss James, New York City

Randall J. LeBoeuf, Albany
William Loeb, Jr., New York City
William F. McCombs, New York City
John Mitchell, Mt. Vernon
Adelbert Moot, Buffalo
William Fellowes Morgan, New York City
William Nottingham, Syracuse, N. Y.
Benjamin B. Odell, Newburgh
James A. O'Gorman, New York City
George W. Perkins, New York City
Thomas R. Proctor, Utica
William L. Ransom, New York City
Dr. Charles F. Richmond, Schenectady
Victor Ridder, New York City
Edward Schoeneck, Syracuse
Jacob Gould Schurman, Ithaca
Henry Seligman, New York City
Clarence J. Shearn, New York City
Charles P. Steinmetz, Schenectady
Joseph W. Stevens, Albany
Willard D. Straight, New York City
Prof. Hendrik W. Van Loon, Ithaca
George C. Van Tuyl, Albany
James W. Wadsworth, Jr., Groveland
Horace White, Syracuse
Horace S. Wilkinson, Syracuse
Alan R. Hawley, New York City
Mrs. Douglas Robinson, New York City
Mrs. Vincent Astor, New York City
Mrs. C. B. Alexander, New York City
Mrs. Edward R. Hewitt, New York City
Mrs. William Cumming Story, New York City
Mrs. William Randolph Hearst, New York City
Mrs. W. K. Vanderbilt, New York City
Miss Anne Morgan, New York City
Mrs. J. Norman de R. Whitehouse, New York City
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, New York City
Henry Woodhouse, New York City
Mrs. Henry P. Davison, New York City
Mrs. S. Stanwood Menken, New York City
Dr. Sidney E. Mozes, New York City
Frank H. Bliss, Buffalo
Mrs. Conger Goodyear, Buffalo
Mrs. Warham Whitney, Rochester
Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt, New York City
Mrs. Wm. Bayard Van Rensselaer, Albany
Mrs. Benjamin W. Arnold, Albany
Mrs. Perry Belmont, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. George D. Pratt, Albany

By Hon. Frank B. Willis, Governor of Ohio

Hon. Charles Dick, Akron
Hon. Joseph S. Ralston, Columbus
Hon. Wm. Cooper Proctor, Cincinnati

By Hon. James Withycombe, Governor of Oregon

Ellsworth Benham, Portland

By Hon. M. G. Brumbaugh, Governor of Pennsylvania

Dr. Alfred Reginald Allen, Philadelphia
Capt. Robert Morris, Philadelphia
Thomas S. Martin, Jr., Philadelphia

By Hon. R. Livingston Beeckman, Governor of Rhode Island

Gen. Chas. W. Abbott, Providence
Richard S. Aldrich, Providence
Capt. Edgar R. Barker, Providence
Col. Samuel P. Colt, Bristol
Col. Harry Cutler, Providence
Hon. Wm. W. Douglas, Providence
Matthew S. Dwyer, Providence
Walter S. Hackney, Providence
Dr. John W. Keefe, Providence
T. F. I. McDonnell, Providence
Jesse H. Metcalf, Providence
Stephen O. Metcalfe, Providence
Byron S. Watson, Providence
Richard B. Comstock, Providence
Wm. H. Hodgman, East Greenwich
Allison Stone, Providence
John E. Marshall, Providence

By Hon. E. L. Philip, Governor of Wisconsin

Willet M. Spooner, Milwaukee
Frank X. Boden, Milwaukee

APPOINTED BY MAYORS

ALABAMA

By Hon. Harry Pillans, Mayor of Mobile

Gregory L. Smith
William Vizard
Richard V. Taylor

ARKANSAS

By Hon. Henry C. Read, Mayor of Fort Smith

George F. Youmans

By Hon. J. W. McClendon, Mayor of Hot Springs

Col. Sam W. Fordyce
R. N. Roth
L. D. Cooper

GEORGIA

By Hon. J. Gordon Jones, Mayor of Cordele

Judge W. P. Fleming
Prof. A. L. Brewer
Charles E. Brown

ILLINOIS

By Hon. Wm. Hale Thompson, Mayor of Chicago

Samuel Hastings
E. A. Potter
Alexander H. Revell
Walter H. Wilson

William E. Clough
John A. Spoor
E. J. Buffington
Chas. Piez
Siles Strawn
Robert J. Thorne
R. J. Dunham
Fred H. Rawson
John V. Farwell
Charles L. Dering
Daniel J. Schuyler
William A. Tilden
Francis S. Peabody
Edward F. Carry
La Verne W. Noyes
John A. Lynch
D. R. Forgan
Dennis F. Kelly
Wm. Wrigley, Jr.
Charles H. Markham
Ernest R. Graham
Wm. Nelson Pelouze
Harry A. Wheeler
R. L. Crampton
James B. Forgan
Gen. Edward C. Young
Reuben H. Donneley
Everett C. Brown
Hon. Orrin N. Carter
Solomon A. Smith
Rev. Rufus A. White
A. A. Sprague II.
Charles G. Dawes
Homer A. Stillwell
Leo E. Ernst
Bishop Samuel Fallows
Maj. R. R. McCormick
Hon. Fred W. Upham
Henry R. Rathbone
W. Rufus Abbott
Robert S. Iles
John T. Stockton
L. A. Goddard
Spencer Otis
Hon. John R. Thompson
C. H. Canby
George F. Porter
Hon. Jas. H. Lawley
John C. Shaffer
Hobart Chatfield-Taylor
Jas. A. Patten
Robert Isham Randolph
Frank I. Bennett
W. B. Austin
Wm. D. McJunkin
Fred Rossbach
E. M. Holloway
John M. Harlan
Alonzo Burt
Leonard A. Bushby

Clifford Arrick
Lafayette Markle
Franc Gardner
Geo. T. Buckingham
Hon. Jacob M. Dickinson
Hon. Geo. Edmund Foss
Edward E. Gore
Hon. Jesse A. Baldwin
Hon. Richard S. Tuthill
John D. Shoop
John F. Smulski
Prof. Harry P. Judson
Col. Milton J. Foreman
J. Harry Jones
Max Pam
B. H. Heide
George A. McKinlock
Lucius Teter
Willis J. Wells
Walter J. Raymer
B. A. Eckhart
H. H. Gross

By Hon. Wm. C. Barber, Mayor of Joilet

George Warner Young
Col. Fred Bennitt
John E. Morrison
Mrs. Elbert E. Bates

By Hon. William W. Bennett, Mayor of Rockford

Fred E. Carpenter
P. A. Paterson
Robert Rew

INDIANA

By Hon. J. O. Batchelor, Mayor of Marion

Col. L. J. McColloch
Hon. Samuel Stricler
Hon. George A. Osborn

IOWA

By Hon. James M. Bell, Mayor of Burlington

Alex Moir
Henry Ritter
Wm. Carson

By Hon. Truman A. Potter, Mayor of Mason City

Rev. E. J. Dougherty
C. H. McNider
James E. Blythe

By Hon. J. G. Harrold, Mayor of Oskaloosa

R. T. Penders
H. H. Sheriff
H. C. Loflane

KENTUCKY

By Hon. W. M. Salisbury, Mayor of Ashland

E. C. Means
Hon. John F. Hager
S. S. Willis

LOUISIANA

By Hon. A. Grouchy, Jr., Mayor of Baton Rouge

Hon. W. O. Scroggs
Hon. T. Jones Cross
Amos K. Gordon

MAINE

By Hon. F. C. Flint, Mayor of Rockland

Hon. Wm. T. Cobb
Hon. Rodney I. Thompson
Blanchard B. Smith

MASSACHUSETTS

By Hon. George M. Wright, Mayor of Worcester

Henry H. Chamberlin
George I. Rockwood
George Crompton

MISSOURI

By Hon. Elliott Marshall, Mayor of St. Joseph

R. T. Forbes
L. T. Golding
J. G. Wing

By Hon. Henry W. Kiel, Mayor of St. Louis

Louis P. Aloe
Robert S. Brockings
G. A. Buder
George Warren Brown
Dr. V. P. Blair
Col. Martin J. Collins
John W. Cook
Eugene R. Cuendet
Col. A. B. Donnelly
John H. Gundlach
Hon. Frederick D. Gardner
Clarence H. Howard
Walker Hill
Harry B. Hawes
C. L. Holman
Jackson Johnson
Albert Bond Lambert
E. P. Lampkin
John S. Leahy
John Lawrence Mauran
Owen B. Miller
Judge Albert D. Nortoni
Henry S. Priest

Joseph Pulitzer, Jr.
Rev. Z. B. T. Phillips
A. L. Shapleigh
Benjamin P. Stromberg
Colin M. Selph
Judge Selden P. Spencer
Rev. Martin S. Sommers
George J. Tansey
Daniel G. Taylor
Melville L. Wilkinson
Sterling Edmunds
Edward F. Goltra
Ben Blewett
Albert von Hoffman

NEBRASKA

By Hon. James C. Dahlman, Mayor of Omaha

Gen. George H. Harries
T. J. Nolan
C. O. Lobeck
James H. Hanley
Frank H. Judson
W. Fraser
Frank B. Johnson
Nels Updike
Arthur C. Smith
Thomas C. Byrne

NEW HAMPSHIRE

By Hon. Harry W. Spaulding, Mayor of Manchester

Hon. Sherman E. Burroughs
Hon. Edwin F. Jones
Hon. James B. Tuttle

NEW JERSEY

By Hon. Harry Bacharach, Mayor of Atlantic City

Sigmund Ojserkis
Joseph W. Mott
Samuel C. Osborne

By Hon. Worrall F. Mountain, Mayor of East Orange

Albert R. Lee
George A. Cullen
David L. Pierson

By Hon. Milton Demarest, President of Improvement Commission

William C. Gregg
Frederick B. Van Vorst
Hon. Wm. M. Johnson
Major Charles F. Adams
Wm. A. Linn

By Hon. Louis F. Dodd, Mayor of Montclair

Wm. B. Dickson
W. I. Lincoln Adams
John B. Wight
Hon. Louis F. Dodd

By Hon. Emil Diebitsch, Mayor of Nutley
Col. H. G. Prout
Goldthwaite Dorr
W. H. Parry

By Hon. Ruford Franklin, Mayor of Summit
Hon. Ruford Franklin
Walter S. Topping
Jacob S. Wiley

By Hon. Farnham Yardley, Mayor of West Orange
H. Lloyd Folsom
Charles Edison
Francis J. Byrne

By Hon. Henry W. Evans, Mayor of Westfield
Herman H. Griswold
K. R. Hare
Harry Hale
Howard Cline

NEW YORK

By Hon. Joseph W. Stevens, Mayor of Albany
Clarence E. Newman
Ledyard Cogswell
Henry H. Kohn

By Hon. Louis P. Fuhrmann, Buffalo
Joseph G. Bellanca
John L. Clawson
Walter P. Cooke
James L. Crane
George Giessen
George W. Jennings
Arthur E. Hedstrom
E. J. Hussey
Thomas B. Lockwood
Gerhard Lang
H. A. Kamman
H. A. Meldrum
Edward G. Oliver
Robert W. Pomeroy
Charles P. Norton
William H. Sanford
John P. Sullivan
George P. Urban
A. B. Wright
M. Wollens
Allan Fraser

By Hon. Frederick E. Bates, Mayor of Ithaca
R. B. Williams
C. D. Bouton
R. G. H. Speed

By Hon. Abram Zoller, Mayor of Little Falls
Hon. Homer P. Snyder

By Hon. Edwin W. Fiske, Mayor of Mt. Vernon

Arthur Mills Johnson
E. Irving Hull
James P. Hayes

By Hon. Purroy Mitchel, Mayor of New York City

Hon. Robert Adamson
George T. Adee
Winthrop W. Aldrich
Gen. Daniel Appleton
F. R. Appleton, Jr.
Col. Andrew D. Baird
George F. Baker, Jr.
Otto T. Bannard
Donn Barber
George Gordon Battle
Daniel C. Beard
W. C. Bergen
R. C. Bolling
Henry Bruere
George W. Burleigh
Rev. S. Parkes Cadman
Lawrence F. Carroll
Robert J. Collier
Lewis L. Clarke
Philip J. Kearns
Dr. J. J. Kindred
F. C. Havemeyer
Samuel A. Lewisohn
Martin W. Littleton
Hon. George McAneny
Hon. George B. McClellan
William F. McCombs
Samuel McRoberts
Clarence H. Mackay
Louis Marshall
Richard W. Meade
Hon. Herman A. Metz
John C. Milburn
Gardner H. Miller
Stephen C. Millett
Ogden L. Mills
Victor Morawets
R. A. Cowles
Joseph P. Day
Norman S. Dike
Herbert L. Dillon
Julian D. Fairchild
James B. Ford
E. H. Gary
William E. Harmon
Col. William Hayward
Timothy Healy
James F. Hurley
Herbert L. Satterlee
Charles Scribner
Herbert B. Swope
William B. Thompson
John F. Wallace
Howard Wheeler

Arthur Woods
J. G. White
William C. Muschenheim
Ludwig Nissen
Hon. Morgan J. O'Brien
Herbert Parsons
Ralph Peters
Gen. Horace Porter
Lewis E. Pounds
Hon. William A. Pendergast
Frank Presbrey
Dr. Wm. S. Rainsford
William C. Reick
B. H. Ridder
Jacob H. Schiff
Paul Starrett
Hon. Oscar S. Straus
Hon. Henry R. Towne
Rodman Wanamaker
Howard Wheeler
William G. Wilcox
Henry A. Wise Wood

By Hon. W. B. Moons, Mayor of Plattsburg

Hon. John F. O'Brien
Hon. Thomas F. Conway
William B. Jacques

By Hon. I. R. Green, Mayor of Watertown

Hon. George H. Cobb
D. L. Anderson
Hiram S. Arthur

By Hon. F. M. Thompson, Mayor of White Plains

William Muldoon
John M. Digney
J. T. Lockwood
Joseph H. Mead
Arthur N. Dusenbury

NORTH CAROLINA

By Hon. T. L. Kirkpatrick, Mayor of Charlotte

W. C. Wilkinson
Chas. A. Bland
A. Collins
Capt. W. R. Cox

By Hon. P. G. Sawyer, Elizabeth City

Hon. E. F. Aydlett
Hon. J. C. B. Ehringhaus
Hon. R. W. Turner

By Hon. W. P. Pickett, Mayor of High Point

R. T. Pickens
A. E. Tate
C. C. Barnhart

By Hon. C. B. Armstrong, Mayor of Gastonia

S. N. Boyce
E. G. McLurd
A. G. Myers

By Hon. Frederick I. Sutton, Mayor of Kinston

N. J. Rouse
Dr. J. M. Parrott
C. Felix Harvey

By Hon. Mr. Bangert, Mayor of New Bern

Hon. Larry I. Moore
Samuel M. Brinson
C. D. Bradham

By Hon. L. F. Tillery, Mayor of Rocky Mount

L. V. Bassett
J. W. Hines
F. S. Spruill

By Hon. C. B. Eaton, Mayor of Winston-Salem

Hon. Clement Manly
E. B. Jones
Dr. H. E. Rondthaler

OHIO

By Hon. C. S. Westover, Mayor of Alliance

A. B. Moore
P. E. McConnell
B. F. Weybrecht

By Hon. Harry L. Davis, Mayor of Cleveland

J. B. Zerbe
Chas. A. Otis
Harry L. Vail

By Hon. George W. Shroyer, Mayor of Dayton

Col. W. J. White
Robert Patterson
Fred J. Ach
C. H. Bosler

By Hon. V. B. Hovey, Mayor of Marietta

George Wheeler Hinman
Lt. Col. Louis C. Lucas
Daniel B. Torpy

By Hon. Charles M. Milroy, Mayor of Toledo

Henry Theobold

PENNSYLVANIA

By Hon. Thomas B. Smith, Mayor of Philadelphia

Samuel T. Bodine
Walton Clark
Col. J. Howell Cummings
Mrs. George Dallas Dixon
Ellis A. Gimbel
Dr. E. B. Gleason
Mrs. John C. Groome

Isaac D. Hetzel
James E. Lennon
Col. Samuel D. Lit
Hugh McCaffrey
Joseph B. McCall
Mrs. J. Willis Martin
Col. Sheldon Potter
Mrs. Thomas Robins
Dr. Edgar Fahs Smith
Joseph N. Snellenburg
Theodore E. Jenkins
Charles B. Hall
Daniel Wade
Franklin Spencer Edmonds
General Wm. G. Price, Jr.
Mrs. Geo. Wharton Pepper
Mrs. Jas. Starr
Powell Evans

By Hon. Joseph G. Armstrong, Mayor of Pittsburgh

Hon. Joseph G. Armstrong
Hon. William Flinn
Hon. Robert Garland
Mr. Charles J. Graham
Mrs. William B. Schiller
Mrs. H. Wilfred DuPuy
Mrs. J. W. Lawrence
Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Morehead
Mr. and Mrs. Marcus Rauh
Mr. and Mrs. Dilworth Beggs
Mr. Joseph Dilworth
Alexander Laughlin
William Moore Patch
D. F. Crawford
B. C. Moise
R. L. O'Donnell
John F. Casey
E. V. Babcock
L. M. Johnston
A. Rex Flinn
Samuel C. Jamison
John E. Laughlin
Mr. and Mrs. Frank J. Lanahan
Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Flannery
Thomas W. Fitch, Jr.

By the Hon. J. L. Bardine, Mayor of Juanita

A. R. Burket
W. R. Peterman
R. N. Hoover

By the Hon. F. Pierce Mortimer, Mayor of Pottsville

Harry J. Zerbey
Harry I. Silliman
Charles Meyers

By the Hon. Burges Richard Beaston, Mayor of Tyrone

John K. Johnston
Wm. H. Scullin
A. R. Grier

RHODE ISLAND

By Hon. Joseph H. Gainor, Mayor of Providence

The delegation appointed by the Mayor of Providence is the same as the delegation appointed by the Governor of Rhode Island.

SOUTH CAROLINA

By Hon. L. A. Griffith, Mayor of Columbia

S. L. Miller, Columbia
Major James H. Hammond, Columbia
Alan Johnstone, Columbia

TEXAS

By Hon. H. C. McGown, Mayor of Brownwood

Hon. Chester Harrison, Washington, D. C.
W. D. McChristy, Brownwood
A. H. Richardson, Brownwood

By Hon. Henry D. Lindsay, Mayor of Dallas

Royal A. Ferris
J. E. Fransworth
Harry L. Seay

By Hon. J. Z. Keel, Mayor of Gainesville

Hon. Joseph W. Baily
J. M. Potter
W. E. Murphy

UTAH

By Hon. W. Mont Ferry, Mayor of Salt Lake City

Hon. Reed Smoot, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Geo. Sutherland, Washington, D. C.

VERMONT

By Hon. Albert S. Drew, Mayor of Burlington

Gen. Theodore Safford Peck
Charles Lincoln Woodbury
John H. Simms

VIRGINIA

By Hon. Thomas A. Fisher, Mayor of Alexandria

Henry K. Field
James W. Bales
C. Keith Carlin

By Hon. E. G. Haden, Mayor of Charlottesville

L. T. Hanckle
G. W. Olivier
J. H. Lindsay

By Hon. Thos. L. Sclater, Mayor of Hampton

Francis F. Causey
Rev. W. P. Stuart
R. I. Mason

WEST VIRGINIA

By Hon. P. W. Leiter, Mayor of Martinsburg
Judge E. Boyd Faulkner
George Ryneal, Jr.
Z. T. Brantner

By Hon. H. L. Kirk, Mayor of Wheeling
Hon. Geo. W. Lutz
Judge B. S. Honecker
Rev. Claude Porter Terry

WISCONSIN

By Hon. H. E. Marquardt, Mayor of Wausau
Hon. A. L. Kreutzer
Hon. C. C. Tawkey
Hon. L. A. Pradt

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Bates College, Lewiston, Me.
By Dr. George C. Chase, President
Frank H. Briggs, Washington, D. C.
Oscar C. Merrill, Washington, D. C.
Augustus P. Norton, Washington, D. C.

Berea College, Berea, Ky.
By Dr. William Goodell Frost, President
George X. McLanahan, Washington, D. C.

Blackstone Military Academy, Blackstone, Va.
Elvin S. Ligon, President

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Amme Brown, Washington, D. C.

Central College, Conway, Ark
By Dr. John W. Conger, President
Hon. H. M. Jacoway, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Sam M. Taylor, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Wm. F. Kirby, Washington, D. C.

College of City of New York
By Dr. Sidney E. Mezes, President
Prof. Paul Saurel, New York City
Prof. Walter E. Clark, New York City

Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.
By Dr. Wm. F. Slocum, President
Dr. H. L. Shantz, Washington, D. C.

Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.
By Dr. H. C. Parmelee, President
Max W. Ball, Washington, D. C.
Carl E. Lesher, Washington, D. C.
John Hays Hammond, New York City

Columbia University, New York City
By Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President
Benjamin B. Lawrence, New York City
Herbert L. Satterlee, Ph.D., New York City
Franklin H. Giddings, Ph.D., New York City

Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa
By Dr. Chas. W. Flint, President
Hon. Burton E. Sweet, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Cato Sells, Washington, D. C.
Rev. L. C. Clark, Mt. Vernon, Iowa

Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
By Dr. Ernest Martin Hopkins, President
Dr. Ernest Martin Hopkins, Hanover, N. H.
Prof. Edwin Julius Bartlett, Hanover, N. H.
Prof. Harry Edwin Burton, Hanover N. H.

Elon College, Elon College, N. C.
By Dr. W. A. Harper, President
Dr. J. O. Atkinson, Elon College, N. C.
Dr. J. U. Newman, Elon College, N. C.
Dr. E. E. Randolph, Elon College, N. C.

Fork Union Military Academy, Fork Union, Va.
Capt. C. G. Snead, Fork Union, Va.

Franklin College, Franklin, Pa.
By Dr. E. A. Hanley, President
Frank R. Selleck, Washington, D. C.
Miss Emma H. Turner, Washington, D. C.

Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C.
By Dr. Percival Hall, President
Dr. Edward Allen Fay, Washington, D. C.
Dr. Charles R. Ely, Washington, D. C.
Prof. Herbert Day, Washington, D. C.

George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
By Dr. Charles H. Stockton, President
Gen. Maxwell Van Zandt Woodhull, Washington, D. C.

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
F. A. McQuade, Washington, D. C.
Archibald Hopkins, Washington, D. C.
Judge Martin A. Knapp, Washington, D. C.

Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.
By Dr. W. E. Keller, President
Hon. S. H. Miller, Washington, D. C.

Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
By Dr. M. W. Stryker, President
Prof. Frederic B. M. Davenport, Clinton, N. Y.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
By Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell, President
Hon. Robert Bacon, New York City
Guy Murchie, Boston, Mass.
Chas A. Coolidge, Boston, Mass.

Hood College, Frederick, Md.
By Dr. Joseph H. Apple, President
Dr. Joseph H. Apple, Frederick, Md.

Indiana State Board of Education, Indianapolis, Ind.
By Dr. Chas. A. Greathouse, President
Horace E. Ellis, Indianapolis, Ind.
L. N. Hines, Crawfordsville, Ind.
O. M. Pittenger, Frankfort, Ind.

Jackson College, Tufts College, Mass.
Mary W. Warren, Washington, D. C.

Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio
By Dr. Wm. F. Pierce, President
Dr. Wm. F. Pierce, Gambier, Ohio
Prof. Wm. Peters Reeves, Gambier, Ohio.

Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
By Dr. John H. MacCracken, President
Prof. Edward Hart, Easton, Pa.
Prof. Edwin O. Fitch, Jr., Easton, Pa.
Eli Swavely, Washington, D. C.
Prof. Francis W. Dickey, Easton, Pa.

Leland Stanford Junior University, Stanford University, Cal.
By Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, President
Jackson E. Reynolds, New York City
Prof. Thomas A. Storey, New York City
Hon. Carl T. Hayden, Washington, D. C.

Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill.
By Dr. J. N. Tilden, President
A. L. Longbrake, Galesburg, Ill.
Sewell Wright, Washington, D. C.

Loyala University, New Orleans, La.
By Rev A. E. Otis
Joseph M. Rault, Washington, D. C.

Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
By Dr. T. Morey Hodgman, President
Caspar Gregory Dickson, Washington, D. C.

Miami Military Institute, Germantown, Ohio
Orvon Graff Brown, Germantown, Ohio

Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
By Dr. R. M. Hughes, President
Gen. Maxwell Van Zandt Woodhull, Washington, D. C.

Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
By Dr. John M. Thomas, President
Louis W. Austin, Washington, D. C.
George R. Wales, Washington, D. C.
Dr. C. Ford Langworthy, Washington, D. C.
John C. Scofield, Washington, D. C.

Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis.
By Dr. Ellne C. Sabin, President
Hon. August H. Vogel, Milwaukee, Wis.
Hon. John H. Esch, La Crosse, Wis.

Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo.
Col. E. Y. Burton, Mexico, Mo.

Moosehart Vocational Educational Institute, Mooseheart, Ill.
Mathew P. Adams, Mooseheart, Ill.

Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio
By Dr. W. H. McMaster, President
Hon. John W. Hamilton, Washington, D. C.
Hon. W. H. Morgan, Alliance, Ohio
Hon. Philander C. Knox, Washington, D. C.

Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
By Dr. Abram W. Harris, President
Stewart A. Maltman, Washington, D. C.

Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.
By Dr. Ira L. Reeves, President
Gen. Lee S. Tillotson, St. Albans, Vt.
Gen. Wm. Pitt Kellogg, Washington, D. C.
Dr. Ira L. Reeves, Northfield, Vt.
Dewitt S. Kinshaw, New York City

Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.
By Dr. C. E. Hyatt, President
Major John W. Loveland, Englewood, N. J.

Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
By Dr. J. G. Hibben President
Prof. Joseph E. Raycroft, Princeton, N. J.

Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Thomas F. Moran, W. Lafayette, Ind.

Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass.
By Dr. LeBaron R. Briggs, President
Miss Frances Gardiner Davenport, Washington, D. C.

Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
By Dr. Marion Lee Burton, President
Mrs. Wm. P. Borland, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Albert Norton Wood, New York City

Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Stanley L. Galpin, Hartford, Conn.

Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
By Dr. Robert Sharp, President
Hon. H. Garland Dupre, Washington, D. C.
Dr. Benjamin S. Warren, Washington, D. C.
Oscar Wilkinson, Washington, D. C.

Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
By Rev. C. A. Richmond, President
Rev. George Robinson, Washington, D. C.
Col. John Van Rensselaer Hoff, Washington, D. C.
William M. Lewin, Washington, D. C.

University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
By Dr. Harry Pratt Judson, President
Prof. Albion W. Small, Chicago, Ill.

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
Nathan B. Williams, Washington, D. C.

University of Denver, University Park, Denver, Colo.
By Dr. Henry A. Buchtel, President
Francis Lightfoot Lee Hiller, Washington, D. C.
Alfred Nelson Finn, Washington, D. C.

University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
By Dr. A. A. Murphree, President
Prof. O. C. Ault, Gainesville, Fla.
Prof. C. L. Crow, Gainesville, Fla.

University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho
By Dr. Melvin A. Brannon, President
Robert O. Jones, Washington, D. C.

University of Maine, Orono, Me.
By Dr. Robt. Judson Aley, President
Dr. George P. Merrill, Washington, D. C.

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
J. S. Young, Minneapolis

University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
By Dr. Stratton D. Brooks, President
Alba M. Edwards

University of Wisconsin, Madison
By Dr. Charles R. Van Hise, President
Charles Noble Gregory, Washington, D. C.
A. L. Sommers, Sheboygan, Wis.
Charles W. Gilmore, Washington, D. C.
James F. Wilson, Washington, D. C.

University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
By Dr. C. A. Duniway, President
Miss Florence Hellman, Washington, D. C.

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
By Dr. H. N. MacCracken, President
Herbert R. Gurney, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Woodbridge Riley, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Virginia College, Roanoke, Va.
By Dr. Mattie P. Harris, President
Miss Gertrude Neal, Roanoke, Va.
Miss Lorraine Loosen, Roanoke, Va.
Mrs. G. M. Pinckney, Washington, D. C.

Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
By Dr. Ellen F. Pendleton, President
Mrs. Ernest Knaebel, Chevy Chase, D. C.
Miss Jessie Claire McDonald, Washington, D. C.

West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
By Dr. F. B. Trotter, President
Dr. Robert Allen Armstrong, Morgantown, W. Va.
Dr. James Morton Callahan, Morgantown, W. Va.
Prof. Enoch Howard Vickers, Morgantown, W. Va.

Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington
By Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, President
Senator William E. Borah, Washington, D. C.
Senator James H. Brady, Washington, D. C.
E. D. Baldwin, Washington, D. C.

Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio
By Dr. W. S. Scarborough, President
Dr. W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce, Ohio

Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
By Dr. E. D. Warfield, President
Dr. Ethelbert D. Warfield, Chambersburg, Pa.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Refrigeration
J. M. Culp, Washington, D. C.
Albert M. Read, Washington, D. C.
E. O. Whitford, Washington, D. C.

American Feed Manufacturers' Association
Warren R. Anderson, Milwaukee, Wis.

American Medical Trade Association
William Gibson, Washington, D. C.

American Rope Manufacturers' Association
Lawrence F. Smith, Kansas City, Mo.
R. D. Magill, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Allen E. Whiting, Philadelphia, Pa.

Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association
Theodore Justice, Philadelphia, Pa.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America
Bascom Little, Cleveland, O.
R. T. Cunningham, Fairmont, W. Va.
Louis T. Golding, St. Joseph, Mo.

Commercial Law League of America
Judge Frederick L. Siddons, Washington, D. C.
E. C. Brandenburg, Washington, D. C.
Jackson H. Ralston, Washington, D. C.
H. Winship Wheatley, Washington, D. C.

National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America
James A. Emery, Washington, D. C.
George D. Iverson, Jr., Baltimore, Md.
George S. Boudinot, New York City
William R. Corwine, New York City

National Boot & Shoe Manufacturers' Association of the United States of America

Hon. A. S. Kreider, Annville, Pa.

National Brick Manufacturers' Association of the United States of America

L. Perry West, Washington, D. C.
Warren Griffith, Baltimore, Md.
John H. Miller, Washington, D. C.

National Hay Association

Egil Steen, Baltimore, Md.
H. G. Carter, Richmond, Va.
J. V. Craig, Washington, D. C.

National Paint, Oil & Varnish Association

H. B. Davis, Baltimore, Md.
Hugh Reilly, Washingotn, D. C.
F. B. Shepherd, Relee, Va.

National Rivers & Harbors Congress

Theodore Justice, Philadelphia, Pa.

Silk Association of America

Benedict Erstein, New York City
W. C. W. Aufermann, New York City

COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATIONS

ALABAMA

Alabama Live Stock Association

Robert L. Seale, Livingston, Ala.
J. E. Dunaway, Orrville, Ala.
Dr. J. F. Yarborough, Columbia, Ala.

Alabama Bankers' Association

Mrs. G. H. Mathia, Gadsden, Alabama

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington Board of Trade

Howard S. Reeside
Henry B. F. McFarland
John G. Capers

Washington Chamber of Commerce

William F. Gude
Charles L. Howser
Walter Brownley

GEORGIA

Albany Chamber of Commerce

Hon. H. A. Tarver
Hon. H. A. Peacock
Hon.C. W. Rawson

ILLINOIS

Illinois State Bankers Branch
John Temple Graves, Chicago, Ill.

Chicago Association of Commerce
Hubert F. Miller

Advertising Association of Chicago
Arnold Joerns
Reuben H. Donnelley
Robert J. Virtue

Hamilton Club of Chicago, Ill.
Emil C. Wetten
F. B. Colliver
Hon. George W. Dixon

Joliet Association of Commerce
C. S. Witwer
George Warner Young
Dr. J. Stanley Brown
Fred Bennitt
E. J. Murphy
H. H. Alexander
O. B. Fuller
J. H. Garnsey
Blaney Beach
Maurice F. Lennon
Mrs. Alice Bennitt Bates

IOWA

Des Moines Chamber of Commerce
H. H. Polk

Fort Dodge Commercial Club
Hon. W. S. Kenyon, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Frank P. Woods, Washington, D. C.
M. D. O'Connell, Washington, D. C.

Greater Iowa Association
C. N. Rich, Keokuk

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston Chamber of Commerce
John S. Lawrence
Everett Morss
Guy Murchie
William G. Renwick
Bernard J. Rothwell

MICHIGAN

Bay City Board of Commerce
Hon. George A. Loud, Washington, D. C.

Detroit Board of Commerce
Walter C. Piper
Walter C. Cole

Grand Rapids Association of Commerce
Senator Wm. Alden Smith, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Carl E. Mapes, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Edwin F. Sweet, Washington, D. C.

MISSOURI

St. Louis Business Men's League

St. Louis Chamber of Commerce
A. L. Shapleigh

St. Louis Convention and Publicity Bureau
Chas. F. Hatfield

Million Population Club, St. Louis, Mo.
Albert von Hoffmann

MONTANA

Great Falls Commercial Club
John McKenzie, Sr.
James A. Shoemaker
Scott Leavitt

Missoula Chamber of Commerce
C. L. F. Kellogg
J. J. Buckley
Judge A. L. Duncan

NEW YORK

Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens
Henry S. Johnston, Elmhurst, N. Y.

New York Board of Trade & Transportation
Lee Kohns

Ossining Chamber of Commerce
H. A. Cornell, Jr.
James M. Reynolds
Thomas A. E. Wilson

Peekskill Board of Commerce
Hon. James W. Husted, Washington, D. C.

Ridgewood Board of Trade
Edward R. Domschke, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Albert Lackman
Paul A. Ajas, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rochester Chamber of Commerce
James G. Cutler
Dr. Rush Rhees
George W. Todd
Kingman N. Robins
Howard Converse
Capt. Henry W. Morse
Frank W. Lovejoy
Andrew E. Tuck
Charles F. Lomb
George H. Clune

Edward G. Miner
William C. Barry, Jr.
E. Franklin Brewster, Jr.
Henry D. Shedd
Albert B. Eastwood

Syracuse Chamber of Commerce

Donald Dey
Newell B. Woodworth

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina Good Roads Association, Lexington, N. C.

Hon. W. C. Jones, High Point, N. C.
Hon. James A. Wellons, Smithfield, N. C.
Hon. E. L. Daughtridge, Rocky Mount, N. C.

Raleigh Chamber of Commerce

L. D. Stephenson
Rev. M. Bradshaw
T. H. Calvert

Department of Agriculture, Raleigh, N. C.

Hon. A. L. Brooks, Greensboro, N. C.
Hon. T. F. Kluttz, Salisbury, N. C.
Hon. J. D. Elliott, Hickory, N. C.

OREGON

Commercial Association of Pendleton

John T. Lathrop, New York City
Hon. N. J. Sinnott, Washington, D. C.

PENNSYLVANIA

Scranton Board of Trade

E. L. Merriman

RHODE ISLAND

Providence Chamber of Commerce

Richard B. Comstock
Frank L. Hinckley
T. F. I. McDonnell
Walter S. Hackney
Stephen O. Metcalf

SOUTH CAROLINA

Cotton Manufacturers' Association of South Carolina, Greenville, S. C.

Col. Leroy Springs, Lancaster, S. C.
Z. F. Wright, Newberry, S. C.
B. B. Gossett, Anderson, S. C.

South Carolina Bankers' Association

J. P. Matthews, Columbia, S. C.
Bright Williamson, Darlington, S. C.
Col. Leroy Springs, Lancaster, S. C.

TENNESSEE

Knoxville Board of Commerce

Hugh M. Tate
J. L. Bowles, Jr.
Glen Levin Swiggett

TEXAS

Trades Extension Bureau of Board of City Development, Amarillo

E. W. Hardin
G. W. Fallar
J. E. Bryant

Austin Chamber of Commerce

L. J. Schneider
B. L. Dillingham
L. E. Shelby

Department of Agriculture, Austin

Hon. Homer D. Wade, Stamford, Tex.
Hon. Baldwin Rice, Houston, Tex.
Hon. George W. Riddle, Dallas, Tex.

Dallas Chamber of Commerce & Manufacturers' Association

J. E. Farnsworth
Royal A. Ferris
Harry L. Seay

San Antonio Chamber of Commerce

Leo M. Sack, Washington, D. C.

VIRGINIA

Southern Hardware Jobbers' Association, Richmond

John Donnan
Arthur J. May, Washington, D. C.
C. H. Ireland, Greensboro, N. C.

VERMONT

Greater Vermont Association, Burlington

Hon. Frank L. Greene, St. Albans
Hon. Porter H. Dale, Island Pond
Hon. F. H. Babbitt, president, Bellows Falls

WEST VIRGINIA

Wheeling Commercial Association

George W. Lutz
Judge Benjamin S. Honecker
J. Sumner Jones

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee Merchants & Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis.

Willet M. Spooner
A. W. Berresford
Louis E. Strothman
Grant T. Stephenson
August H. Vogel

Wisconsin Association of Commercial Secretaries, Sheboygan, Wis.

G. D. Sommers

PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES

American Cross of Honor

Thomas H. Herndon, Washington, D. C.

American Defense Society

Dr. David Jayne Hill, Washington, D. C.
Henry C. Quimby, New York City
J. H. Coit, New York City
Geo. Garner, Washington, D. C.

American Rights League

Major George Haven Putnam, New York City
Everett V. Abbot, New York City
Charles P. Howland, New York City
Richard M. Hurd, New York City

Army and Navy Union

Lt. Genl. H. Oden Lake, Natl. Com., Washington, D. C.
Brig. Genl. W. W. Langdale, Adj. Genl., Washington, D. C.
Col. Julius E. Albrecht, Natl. Aid-de-camp, Washington, D. C.
Brig. Genl. Charles F. Rougeou, Quartermaster General, Washington, D. C.

Army and Navy Veterans, U. S. A.

Hon. Verne M. Bovie, New York City
Judge Anson S. Taylor, Washington, D. C.
Walter McCoy, New York City
Capt. Patrick J. Graham, New York City

Army of the Philippines

Gen. George F. Chase, Washington, D .C.
Col. Philip F. Harvey, Washington, D. C.
Col. James Hamilton Lewis, Washington, D. C.

Boy Scouts of America

Charles C. Jackson, Boston, Mass.
Daniel Carter Beard, Flushing, N. Y.
James E. West, New York City
Colin H. Livingstone, Washington, D. C.

Colonial Dames of America

Mrs. Henry Granville Sharpe, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Julian James, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Allan McLane, Washington, D. C.
Miss S. E. Gilpin, Philadelphia, Pa.
Miss Elizabeth B. Chew, Philadelphia
Mrs. E. de P. Hosmer, New York

Colonial Daughters of America

Mrs. Edward Schaaf, St. Mary's, Mo.
Miss Grace Marie Cheever, Cincinnati, Ohio
Miss Stella Pickett Hardy, Batesville, Ark.
Mrs. Clark Fisher, Reedville, Va.

Conference Committee on National Preparedness

Earl Hamilton Smith, Washington, D. C.

Connecticut State Rifle Association

Edgar J. Taylor, Westbrook, Conn.
F. Howard Rose, Ivoryton, Conn.

Crane Rifle Club

Bernard B. Bulama, Chicago, Ill.

Chicago Rifle Club

Bernard B. Bulama, Chicago, Ill.

Daughters of the American Revolution

Mrs. Robert Lansing, Washington ,D. C.
Mrs. Josephus Daniels, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. George M. Sternberg, Washington, D. C.
Miss Mabel T. Boardman, Washington, D. C.

Daughters of the Revolution

Mrs. Everett Menzies Raynor, New York City
Mrs. J. P. Geran, New York City

Forest Service Rifle Club

Harry Irion, Washington, D. C.

Girls National Honor Guard

Miss Theodora Booth, President, New York City
Miss Agnes G. Smith, New York City

Grand Army of the Republic

James Tanner, Past Commander-in-Chief, Washington, D. C.
William F. Kirchner, New York City
Samuel C. Pierce, Past Dept. Commander, G. A. R., Rochester, N. Y.

Grand Army of the Republic, U. S. Grant Post No. 327, Department of New York

Hon. James Tanner, Wsahington, D. C.
Col. George A. Price, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Hon. George W. Brush, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Interior Dept. Home Club Target Association

Major S. E. Bomas, O. R. C., Washington, D. C.

Joint Committee on Military Affairs of the San Francisco Branches of the National Engineering Society

Arthur S. Dwight, New York City

Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America

Mrs. Monte Griffith, Washington, D. C.

Military Training Camp Association

Arthur S. Dwight, New York City

Military Order of the Medal of Honor

George D. Sidman, Philadelphia, Pa.
Alexander Scott, Washington, D. C.
Capt. Robert G. Carter, Washington, D. C.

Military Training Camp Association

Arthur F. Cosby, New York City
J. Lloyd Derby, New York City
DeLancy K. Jay, New York City
Percy H. Stewart, New York City

National Association of Patriotic Instructors

Theodore C. Cazeau, Rochester, N. Y.
Mrs. Mary M. North, Herndon, Va.
Lieutenant Dodge, Berea, Ky.

National Civic Federation

Mrs. Francis McNeil Bacon, Jr., New York City
Mrs. Rogers H. Bacon, New York City
Mrs. Wendell Baker, New York City
Mrs. Dryden Brewer, New York City
Miss Alice Carpenter, New York City
Mrs. Chas. U. Carpenter, New York City
Mrs. George W. Danzinger, New York City
Mrs. Cass Gilbert, New York City
Mrs. William Greenough, New York City
Mrs. Simon Guggenheim, New York City
Miss Jeanie Knowles, New York City
Mrs. William G. McKnight, New York City
Mrs. E. E. Mapes, New York City
Miss Elizabeth Marbury, New York City
Mrs. Charles F. Meyer, New York City
Miss Anne Morgan, New York City
Mrs. James Mumford, New York City
Miss Lucy K. Powell, New York City
Miss Gertrude Robinson-Smith, New York City
Mrs. Joseph Seligman, New York City
Mrs. Lyndsay Van Rensselaer, New York City
Mrs. Whitney Warren, New York City
Mrs. Arthur E. Briggs, Buffalo, N. Y.
Miss Jane Tiffany, New York City
Mrs. Francis Wolcott, Pavilion, Geneseo Co., N. Y.
Mrs. Frank Fiske, Jr., Buffalo, N. Y.
Mrs. Boylston Beal, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. James D. Layng, Jr., Somers, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilbert Montague, New York City
Mrs. Wm. S. Ely, Rochester, N. Y.
Mrs. Charles S. Whitman, Albany, N. Y.
Mrs. E. W. Cole, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Ivy Lee, Riverdale, N. Y.
Miss Mary J. Wilkeson, Buffalo, N. Y.
Miss Caroline B. Dow, New York City
Mrs. Joseph McQuide, Troy, N. Y.
Mrs. G. Huntington Williams, Baltimore, Md.
Mrs. William Fellowes Morgan, New York City
Mrs. Frederick Mead, New York City

National Council of Women of U. S. A.

Mrs. Mary M. North, Herndon, Va.
Mrs. Kate Waller Barrett, Alexandria, Va.
Mrs. John Hays Hammond, New York City
Mrs. Philip North Moore, St. Louis, Mo.

National School Camp Association

Hon. John Purroy Mitchel, New York City
Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Hon. Herman A. Metz, New York City

National Society of Colonial Dames of America

Mrs. Nathaniel Terry Bacon, Peace Dale, R. I.
Mrs. Overton Lea, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. William Robinson, Garden City, N. Y.
Mrs. Elihu Chauncey, New York City

National Society of Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America

Mrs. Wm. Van Zandt Cox, Brightwood, D. C.
Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Horace P. McIntosh

National Society United States Daughters of 1812

Mrs. T. L. A. Greve, Cincinnati, Ohio
Mrs. Noble N. Potts, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. S. P. S. Mitchell, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. G. M. Brumbaugh, Washington, D. C.

National Special Aid Society

Mrs. Henry A. Wise Wood, New York City

National Special Aid Society, Montclair, N. J. Branch

Mrs. Robert Boyd, Jr.
Mrs. William B. Dickson
Mrs. W. I. Lincoln Adams
Mrs. W. D. Kearfott

National Staff Association Women's Relief Corps

Mrs. Mary H. Dodge, Berea, Ky.

Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War

Major General John L. Clem, Washington, D. C.
Capt. Edward J. Dorn, Washington, D. C.
Naval Cadet B. P. Lamberton, Washington, D. C.

Naval Militia Pennsylvania

Robert K. Wright, U. S. N., Washington, D. C.

Navy League, Woman's Section

Elizabeth E. Poe, Washington, D. C.
Vylla Poe Wilson, Washington, D. C.

Order of Independent Americans

Isaac Dando, Cressona, Pa.
R. D. Dickson, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Wm. A. Pike, Philadelphia, Pa.

Order of Washington

Commander General-Rear Admiral Charles H. Stockton, U. S. N., Ret., Washington, D. C.
Third Vice-Commander-General Dr. Edwin Allston Hill, Washington, D. C.
Fifth Vice-Commander-General Daniel Smith Gordon, Washington, D. C.

Patriotic Education Society

Emerson McMillin, New York City
Raymond B. Price, New York City
Henry A. Wise Wood, New York City

Patriotic Society of Kingston

Howard Wheeler, New York City
Rev. J. Caleb Justice, Kingston, Mass.

Society of American Wars

Gen. Wm. H. Bixby, Washington, D. C.
Admiral Franklin J. Drake, Washington, D. C.
Admiral Charles J. Badger, Washington, D. C.

Sons of the American Revolution

A. Howard Clark, Washington, D. C.

Sons of the American Revolution, Rochester, N. Y. Chapter

Charles E. Ogden

Society of the Army of the Cumberland

Maj. Gen. James H. Wilson, Wilmington, Del.
Brig. Gen. Anson Mills, Washington, D. C.
Col. Gilbert O. Kniffen, Tacoma Park, D. C.

Society of the Army of the Potomac

Col. Myron M. Parker, Washington, D. C., Chairman
Col. Geo. H. Patrick, Washington, D. C.
A. S. Perham, U. S. V., Washington, D. C.
Hon. Redfield Proctor, Montpelier, Vt.
Maj. Chas. L. Woodbury, Burlington, Vt.
Gen. Horatio C. King, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Charles A. Shaw, Mt. Kisco, N. Y.
Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Grant, Minneapolis, Minn.
Col. Andrew Cowan, Louisville, Ky.
Gen. James M. Schoonmaker, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Gen. Selden Connor, Augusta, Me.
Col. Samuel E. Pingree, Hartford, Vt.
Hon. Ira H. Evans, Austin, Tex.
Thomas S. Hopkins, Washington, D. C.
Maj. Wm. P. Shreve, Boston, Mass.
Col. George Truesdell, Washington, D. C.
Capt. Robert Armour, Washington, D. C.
Maj. Chas. D. Loeffler, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Edw. C. Smith, St. Albans, Vt.
Alexander S. Webb, New York City
Hon. Daniel L. Cady, New York City
Albert Andrew Cowan, Louisville, Ky.
Rev. I. C. Smart, D.D., Burlington, Vt.
Frank R. Wells, Burlington, Vt.
Hon. Max L. Powell, Burlington, Vt.
Maj. Harvey R. Kingsley, Rutland, Vt.
Myron M. Parker, Jr., Washington, D. C.
Maj. Linn D. Taylor, Brattleboro, Vt.

Society of the Army of Santiago de Cuba

Brig. Gen. Wm. A. Mann, Washington, D. C.
Lt. Col. C. Fred Cook, Washington, D. C.

Sons of Confederate Veterans

Ernest G. Baldwin, Commander-in-Chief, Roanoke, Va.
Dr. Clarence Owens, Washington, D. C.
F. R. Fravel, Washington, D. C.
Claude M. Bennett, Washington, D. C.

Sons of Confederate Veterans, District of Columbia Division

W. E. Brockman, Washington, D. C.
Edward A. Brand, Washington, D. C.
J. Roy Price, Washington, D. C.
George T. Rawlins, Washington, D. C.

Sons of the Revolution in the District of Columbia

Brigadier-General George Richards, Chairman
Rev. Dr. Randolph H. McKim
Colonel John Van R. Hoff

Sons of Veterans, United States of America

F. T. F. Johnson, Washington, D. C.
H. V. Speelman, Washington, D. C.
Francis E. Cross, Washington, D. C.

Sons of Veterans, U. S. A., Maryland Division, Lincoln Camp No. 2

Nelson V. D. Brecht
Victor L. Garrigus
John T. Bond

Special Aid Society for American Preparedness, Massachusetts Branch

Mrs. Elmer J. Bliss, Boston
Mrs. William R. Castle, Jr., Boston
Mrs. J. R. Coolidge, Jr., Brookline
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Rever Frothingham, Boston
Mrs. William A. Gaston, Boston
Mrs. George S. Mumford, Chestnut Hill
Mr. and Mrs. Harold Murdock, Chestnut Hill
Mrs. Henry Parkman, Boston
Mrs. Robert S. Russell, Boston
Mrs. Robert Saltonstall, Readville
Mrs. R. M. Saltonstall, Chestnut Hill
Mrs. J. M. Sears, Boston
Miss Mary C. Spaulding, Melrose
Mrs. W. W. Taff, Brookline
Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Boston
Mrs. R. D. Weston, Cambridge
Mrs. J. C. Phillips, Jr., Wenham
Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Boston
Mrs. Walton Green, Auburndale
Mrs. John Pearmain, Framingham
Mrs. John T. Chase, Melrose
Mrs. William S. Blake, Melrose
Miss Grace Richards, Hingham
Miss Sarah Bradley, Hingham
Mrs. Sinclair Kennedy, Brookline
Mrs. Alfred Aiken, Worcester
Miss Charlotte Baylies, Boston
Mrs. Horace Binney, Boston
Mrs. E. Howard Child, Boston
Mrs. G. R. Fearing, Jr., Boston
Miss Grace S. Lockwood, Boston
Mrs. John Lowell, Boston
Mrs. Edmund M. Parker, Cambridge
Mrs. Bernard J. Rothwell, Needham
Miss Nora Saltonstall, Boston
Mrs. Frank Williams, Brookline
Mrs. Chas. B. Amory, Boston
Mrs. C. L. Tilden, Hyde Park
Mrs. Chas. Bird, East Walpole
Mrs. Everett Morss, Boston
Mrs. Thorndike D. Howe, Lawrence
Mrs. Mary Rodgers, Melrose
Miss Nancy E. Barton, Worcester

Mrs. James J. Storrow, Boston
Mrs. George E. Burgess, Hyde Park
Mrs. Homer Gage, Worcester
Mrs. J. L. Saltonstall, Boston
Mrs. Samuel E. Winslow, Worcester

Tenafly Rifle Club

Daniel S. Hoag, Tenafly, N. J.

Trinity Rifle Team

Eugene Spencer Brooks, New York City

United Daughters of the Confederacy

Mrs. Frank G. Odenheimer, President-General, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Norment Powell, Johnson City, Tenn.
Mrs. C. D. Merwin, Washington, D. C.

Union Veteran Legion

W. T. Foster, Washington, D. C.

United Military Order of America

J. C. Sprigg, New York City
Rev. Henry W. Battle, Charlottesville, Va.
Col. John L. G. Lee, Baltimore, Md.

United Spanish War Veterans

Senator James K. Vardaman, Washington, D. C.
Senator John W. Weeks, Washington, D. C.
Representative Carl C. Van Dyke, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Sam R. Sells, Washington, D. C.

United States Power Squadrons

A. B. Bennett, Washington, D. C.
William J. Bacon, Jr., Washington, D. C.
Alan D. Clephane, Washington, D. C.

Universal Military Training League

Howard H. Gross, Chicago, Ill.
H. M. Byllesby, Chicago, Ill.
Karl H. Behr, New York City.

Vermont National Guard

Col. I. L. Reeves, St. Albans

Veterans of Foreign Wars

Thomas S. Crags, Waynesburg, Pa.

World's Court League

Hon. John Hays Hammond, New York City
Dr. James Brown Scott, Washington, D. C.
Prof. Samuel T. Dutton, New York City

Washington, D. C., Rifle Club

Lt. Col. A. G. Fortier
Major James J. Meade
C. F. Himmler
James W. Bellinger
Capt. James Mulvey
Capt. Berkeley Inge
Capt. R. H. McGarity
Capt. R. T. J. Barber
Capt. J. H. Mitchell

Capt. Thos. A. Green
Capt. Otto C. Rauschild
Capt. Geo. P. James
Capt. John J. Costinett
Capt. Chas. A. Stevens
Capt. R. G. Stedman

Westfield, N. J., Rifle Club
Clarence Steinbach

LEARNED SOCIETIES

Academy of Political Science in the City of New York
Hon. Wm. L. Ransom, New York City
Prof. Sydney D. M. Hudson, New York City
Miss Emma S. Lake, New York City

American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa.
Gen. Wm. H. Bixby, Washington, D. C.
Ira E. Bennett, Washington, D. C.
Irvine Shupp

American Civic Association
J. Horace McFarland, Harrisburg, Pa.
Wm. B. Howland, New York City
Richard B. Watrous, Washington, D. C.

American Institute of Consulting Engineers
Ralph D. Mershon, New York City
L. B. Stillwell, New York City
E. W. Stern, New York City

American Society of Civil Engineers
Gen. Alexander Mackenzie, Washington, D. C.
A. P. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Frank Sutton, Washington, D. C.

American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Major W. H. Wiley, New York City
F. H. Clark, Baltimore, Md.
Prof. C. C. Thomas, Baltimore, Md.

Connecticut Research Association
Mrs. William Earl Dodge Scott, New Haven
Miss Margarett Fisher, New Haven
Mrs. W. Herbert Wiley, Greenwich

American Sociological Society
Miss Sarah E. Simons
Thomas Walton
Richard B. Watrous

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Arthur A. Hamerschlag

Mining & Metallurgical Society of America
Arthur S. Dwight, New York City
Hennen Jennings, Washington, D. C.
Dr. George Otis Smith, Washington, D. C.

National Institute of Social Sciences

Hon. David Jayne Hill, Washington, D. C.
Miss Mabel T. Boardman, Washington, D. C.
Prof. George F. Becker, New York City

National Institute of Efficiency

William B. Howland, New York City

National Association of Constitutional Government

Col. Archibald Hopkins, Washington, D. C.
Gen. Maxwell Van Zandt Woodhull, Washington, D. C.
Charles Ray Dean, Washington, D. C.

BAR ASSOCIATIONS

Colorado Bar Association

Thomas J. O'Donnell, Denver
Miss Mary F. Lathrop, Denver

District of Columbia Bar Association

F. D. McKenny, Washington, D. C.

Illinois State Bar Association

Nathan Wm. McChesney, Chicago
Robert McMurdy, Chicago
E. C. Kramer, East St. Louis

Maine State Bar Association

Senator Chas. F. Johnson, Washington, D. C.
Congressman D. J. McGillicuddy, Washington, D. C.
Wallace H. White, Jr., Lewiston, Me.

Mississippi State Bar Association

Hon. Marcellus Green, Jackson
Hon. A. F. Cox, West Point
E. R. Holmes, Yazoo City

New Jersey State Bar Association

W. Holt Apgar, Trenton
Edward Q. Keasby, Newark
Walter H. Bacon, Bridgeton

Ohio State Bar Association

Edward Kibler, Newark
Simeon R. Johnson, Cincinnati
M. J. Hartley, Xenia

Wisconsin State Bar Association

W. A. Hayes, Milwaukee
A. L. Kreutzer, Wausau
Hon. E. E. Browne, Waupaca

AERO CLUBS

Aero Club of America, New York City

Chas. Jerome Edwards, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Alan R. Hawley, New York City
W. W. Miller, New York City
James A. Blair, New York City

Aero Club of Hawaii, Honolulu, H. I.
Sidney Ballou, Washington, D. C.

Aero Club of New England
Godfrey L. Cabot, Pensacola, Fla.

Aero Club of Pennsylvania
Joseph A. Steinmetz, Philadelphia
Clarke Thomson, Philadelphia
Robert Clendinning, Philadelphia

Aeronautical Society of America
William J. Hammer, New York City
Ernest D. Anderson, New York City
Francis T. Sanford, New York City

AUTOMOBILE CLUBS

Automobile Club of America
Col. Franklin Q. Brown, New York
Alan R. Hawley, New York

WOMEN'S CLUBS

Charlotte, N. C., Woman's Club
Mrs. Lockwood Jones, Charlotte, N. C.

Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs
Mrs. Chas. B. Timberlake, Sterling, Col.
Mrs. E. T. Taylor, Greenwood Springs, Col.

Girls' Friendly Society of America
Mrs. J. C. Boyd, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. C. Bolton, Washington, D. C.

Needlework Guild of America
Mrs. Truman H. Newbury, Detroit, Mich.

National Woman's League
C. B. Tullis, Washington, D. C.

New York State Federation of Women's Clubs
Mrs. Albert H. Hildreth, Cohoes, N. Y.
Mrs. Edward Balbach, New York City
Mrs. Wm. Grant Brown, New York City

Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs
Miss Althea Seppel, Norfolk
Mrs. George B. Fadeley, Falls Church
Miss Helen Norris Cummings, Alexandria

THE CONSTRUCTIVE NEW THOUGHT MOVEMENT

Mrs. Henry W. Chapin, Boston, Mass.

THE UNITED NATIONS OF THE WORLD—A LEAGUE OF PEACE

William Osborne McDowell, Newark, N. J.

ASSOCIATION AMERICAN SECRETARIES OF STATE

Mr. Stuart F. Reed, President, Clarksburg, W. Va.

Branches

CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles—

Isadore B. Dockweiler, Los Angeles, Cal.
Hon. H. Stanley Benedict, Los Angeles

San Francisco—

Miss E. Alice Theoball

COLORADO

Colorado Springs—

Samuel L. Shober

CONNECTICUT

New Haven—

Prof. Henry W. Farnam, New Haven, Conn.
Leonard S. Horner, New Haven, Conn.
Hon. John Q. Tilson, M. C., New Haven, Conn.
T. Whitney Blake, Whitneyville, Conn.
Col. Ernest L. Isbell, New Haven, Conn.
William H. Carmalt, M.D., New Haven, Conn.
Capt. John H. Alden, New Haven, Conn.
A. B. Woodford, New Haven, Conn.
E. G. Buckland, New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Hiram Bingham, New Haven, Conn.
Henry F. Parmelee, New Haven, Conn.

Stamford—

Hugh L. Cooper

DELAWARE

Dover—

Hon. James H. Hughes
George T. Maxwell
Col. Wm. D. Denney
Robert D. Simmons
Richard R. Kenney

ILLINOIS

Chicago—

Richard Dean
Reuben H. Donnelley
Major Abel Davis
M. O. Traylor
Arnold Joerns
Carl R. Latham
Charles L. Dering
Frank L. Sheppard

P. L. Smithers
Harry H. Merrick
Mrs. Harry H. Merrick
Clifford Arrick
Elbert C. Ferguson
R. J. McKay
Emil C. Wetten
Irving Washington
John W. Thomas
S. M. Hastings
William R. Moss
Nelson N. Lampert
John T. Stockton
J. V. Whiting and Mrs. Whiting
Stanley Clague
Ninian H. Welch
L. H. Armour
A. N. Marquis
Robert Virtue
Dean Albion W. Small
Col. George T. Buckingham

Joliet—

C. S. Witwer
Dr. J. Stanley Brown
E. J. Murphy
O. B. Fuller
Blaney Beach
George Warner Young
Fred Bennitt
H. H. Alexander
J. H. Carnsey
Maurice F. Lennon
Mrs. Alice Bennitt Bates

IOWA

Des Moines—

Homer A. Miller
J. W. Howell
C. L. Herring
Ashton Clemens
Hon. Lafayette Young
Harry H. Polk

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston—

John C. Phillips, Wenham, Mass.
Charles C. Jackson, Boston, Mass.
H. H. Gardiner, Boston, Mass.
Harvey Cushing, M. D., Boston, Mass.
Hon. William F. Murray, Boston, Mass.
Capt. William G. Renwick, Boston, Mass.
Hon. John L. Saltonstall, Beverly, Mass.
C. F. Morss, Boston, Mass.
Miss Mary A. Stowell, Boston, Mass.
Miss Grace W. Conant, Boston, Mass.
Dr. Frances M. Morris, Boston Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Norman E. Borden, Sudbury, Mass.
George S. Mumford, Boston, Mass.

Mr. and Mrs. Sinclair Kennedy, Brookline, Mass.
Arthur Winslow, Boston, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Koch, Cambridge, Mass.
Augustus Hemenway, Boston, Mass.
Bernard J. Rothwell, Boston, Mass.
Adj. Gen. Gardner Pearson, Lowell, Mass.
Guy Murchie, Boston, Mass.
Walton A. Green, Boston, Mass.
Frederic L. Woods, Boston, Mass.
Everett Morss, Boston, Mass.
Commodore James P. Parker, Boston, Mass.
Hon. George von L. Meyer, Boston, Mass.
Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge, Mass.
John S. Lawrence, Boston, Mass.
Dr. Wm. Roscoe Thayer, Cambridge, Mass.
Albert B. Tenney, Boston, Mass.
Charles E. Burbank, Boston, Mass.
John Wells Farley, Boston, Mass.
John A. Knowles, Boston, Mass.
Samuel J. Mixter, M. D., Boston, Mass.
Horace Binney, Boston, Mass.
John S. Ames, Boston, Mass.
Col. John Caswell, Beverly, Mass.
Elmer Jared Bliss, Boston, Mass.
William C. Rogers, Boston, Mass.
Jacob C. R. Peabody, Boston, Mass.
Gasper G. Bacon, Boston, Mass.
Arthur A. Ballentine, Boston, Mass.
Dwight Blaney, Boston, Mass.
Rev. Francis B. Boyer, Boston, Mass.
J. D. Cameron Bradley, Boston, Mass.
Robert S. Bradley, Boston, Mass.
George G. Brewer, Boston, Mass.
Hon. Calvin Coolidge, Boston, Mass.
John Templeton Coolidge, Boston, Mass.
Miss Eleanor Cotton, Boston, Mass.
Hon. Grafton D. Cushing, Boston, Mass.
E. H. Eldredge, Boston, Mass.
Miss Dorothy Forbes, Milton, Mass.
Frederic C. Hood, Boston, Mass.
Major Thorndike Howe, Boston, Mass.
E. J. Leyden, Springfield, Mass.
Henry Lyman, M. D., Canton, Mass.
Grenville S. McFarland, Boston, Mass.
George S. Munford, Boston, Mass.
John Forbes, Perkins, Boston, Mass.
Judge Thos. P. Riley, Boston, Mass.
Robert Saltonstall, Boston, Mass.
E. G. Scott, Ludlow, Mass.
Mrs. J. Montgomery Sears, Southboro, Mass.
Frank W. Stearns, Boston, Mass.
Eliot Wadsworth, Boston, Mass.
Henry L. Williams, Northampton, Mass.
William M. Wood, Boston, Mass.
Arthur A. Ballantine, Boston, Mass.
Eliot Wadsworth, Chairman, American Red Cross
Henry L. Williams, President, Williams Mfg. Co., Northampton
Chester L. Dane, Marblehead
Gasper G. Bacon, Boston
George C. Brewer, Somerville

Mr. and Mrs. Edmund M. Parker, Boston
Philip L. Schuyler
John D. Pearmain, Framingham
Albert B. Tenney, Lexington
Morton Prince, Boston
Miss Sarah S. Winslow, Boston

Worcester—

H. H. Chamberlin
Prof. Ira N. Hollis
A. E. Newton
Henry E. Whitcomb
Earle Brown
S. P. Remington, Centreville, R. I.
K. B. Lewis
A. Edward Warren
H. H. Styll, Southbridge
Henry H. Chamberlain
George Crompton
George I. Rockwood

MICHIGAN

Ann Arbor—

Prof. Henry M. Bates
Dr. Jonathan F. Scott
Dr. William H. Hobbs
Gardner S. Williams

Flint—

Hon. Fenton R. McCreery
W. W. Mountain
Rev. J. B. Pengelley
Dr. C. B. Burr
F. H. Rankin
E. W. Atwood
Walter O. Smith

MINNESOTA

Northfield—

Miss Allice C. Archibald

St. Paul—

Ambrose Tighe, St. Paul, Minn.
Hon. Frederick C. Stevens

MISSOURI

Kansas City—

D. J. Haff
J. L. Loose
William Comstock

St. Louis—

Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Kennery
Mr. and Mrs. Edward K. Love
Mrs. F. V. Hammer
Mr. and Mrs. Frank Rumbold
Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Boyle
T. K. Skinner
Jane Winn

Dr. Z. B. Phillips
Ben Blewett
Colin Selph
A. L. Shapleigh
H. D. Johns

NEW JERSEY

Bordentown—

Robert E. Sievers
Grace D. Sievers

Elizabeth—

Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Allen
Col. and Mrs. Edward Olmsted
Miss Emily H. Suydam
Judge James C. Connolly
Mr. and Mrs. Augustus F. Crane
Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Hubard
Mr. and Mrs. Edgar A. Knapp
Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Ayers Gray
Gen. Dennis F. Collins
Ambrose McManus
Mr. and Mrs. Pierpont V. Davis

Hackensack—

Wm. Burr Gregg

Montclair—

Robert M. Boyd, Jr.
John C. Barclay
Wm. B. Dickson
W. I. Lincoln Adams
Erman J. Ridgway
W. W. Knight
Calvin W. Rice
Henry C. Meyer, Jr.
Harold M. Anderson
Thomas A. Doe

Nutley—

Capt. John B. Applegate
Dr. George B. Philhower
John A. Clark
Benjamin Hurd
H. W. St. John
A. E. Howe
Dr. A. H. Van Riper
F. A. Wellman
H. M. Libby
D. A. Usina

Orange—

Herbert Barry, New York City

Paterson—

Warren Baker, Washington, D. C.
James O'Byrne, Washington, D. C.

Ridgewood—

W. E. Remington
Mrs. W. E. Remington
Arthur C. Mills
George M. Schinzel
Hon. David A. Barber
Rev. T. J. Lansing

Summit—

Carroll P. Bassett
Mrs. C. P. Bassett
Clement K. Corbin
Charles H. Grant
Robert S. Holt
Walter G. Libby
Mrs. Walter G. Libby
L. Rogers Lytton
Mrs. A. Spadone
Philip V. R. Van Wyck
A. Spadone
Jacob S. Wiley

Trenton (Men's Section)—

John L. Kuser
John A. Campbell
Frank S. Katzenbach, Jr.
Richard Stockton
James Kerney
Charles Howell Cook
Frederick W. Gnichtel
Robert C. Maxwell
Herbert Sinclair
Gen. Thomas S. Chambers

Trenton (Women's Section)—

Mildred Apgar
Mrs. Henry Blackwell
Mrs. Malcolm Buchanan
Mrs. Thomas Chambers
Mrs. Charles H. Cook
Mrs. John L. Kuser, Bordentown, N. J.
Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant
Mrs. Karl G. Roebling
Mrs. Richard Stockton
Mrs. Henry D. Styer

Westfield—

Sidney B. Kniffin
Clarence V. Steinhart
W. A. Bishop
Fred S. Tuggert, Newark, N. J.
Mrs. Paul Phillips
Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Thompson
D. M. Pearsall
Wm. E. Tuttle, Jr.
A. N. Pierson
H. H. Griswold
L. H. Phelps
Paul Q. Oliver
Chas. M. Codding
Harry S. Parker

Mr. and Mrs. P. D. Collins
M. T. Townley
George E. Hayes
Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Abrams
Wm. R. Davis
Howard Kline
J. F. Johnston
L. M. Collins
E. A. Merrill

Plainfield—

Mr. and Mrs. C. C. Burke, Jr.

Rutherford—

Mr. and Mrs. Oliver T. Keep

NEW YORK

Brooklyn—

Gen. George W. Wingate
Nathaniel H. Levi
Ludwig Nissen
William W. Owen
Almet Reed Latson

Buffalo—

Hon. Louis P. Fuhrmann
Hon. Chas. M. Heald
Mr. and Mrs. Chas. Clifton
Dr. and Mrs. Marshall Clinton
Henry Ware Sprague
Thomas Cary
Chas. P. Norton
A. C. Goodyear
James L. Crane
Dr. Arthur W. Hurd
Fred E. Williams
A. J. De Laplante
George P. Urban
Dr. Conrad Wettlaufer
C. J. Smith
Mrs. Evan Hollister
Mrs. Henry Ware Sprague
Mrs. A. C. Goodyear
Mrs. James L. Crane
Roderick Potter
Mrs. Roderick Potter
Mrs. A. J. DeLaplante
L. Wallens
Mrs. L. Wallens
C. J. Smith
Edwin A. Rumball
Augustus Underhill
Mrs. Henry Altman
Evan Hollister

Elmhurst—

Clarence Edwards
Dr. Franklin H. Booth
Lewis S. Patterson
Alexander Dujat, Corona, N. Y.

John Silvestro, Winfield, N. Y.
Lewis H. Woodburn
Henry S. Johnston
Francis I. Woodburn
Frederick J. Mason
Charles H. Georgia, Corona, N. Y.

Flushing—

Alexander Gordon
S. Edison Gage
Mrs. Gordon Gordon
Gordon Gordon
Mrs. Francis W. Belknap
Mrs. S. Edson Gage
Theodore T. Lane

Garden City—

Mr. and Mrs. George E. Adams
W. W. Haughey
Edgar R. Walters

Kingston—

Samuel H. Chauvenet
Thomas A. Horton
Robert E. Leighton

New Rochelle—

R. T. Emmet

Niagara Falls—

Frank S. Wheeler

Peekskill—

Hon. James W. Husted

Syracuse—

Gen. Wm. Verbeck Manlius N. Y.
Newell B. Woodworth, Past President General C. A. R.
Donald Dey

White Plains—

Wm. Muldoon, Purchase, N. Y.
John M. Digney
J. T. Lockwood
Joseph H. Mead
Arthur N. Dusenbury
Charles H. Tibbits

OHIO

Cincinnati—

Richard P. Ernst

Dayton—

Col. W. J. White
Robert Patterson
Fred J. Ach
C. H. Bosler

Toledo—

William Biebesheimer
Charles S. Ashley
Henry Theobold

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia—

Charles Biddle
George Wentworth Carr
Walton Clark
Kern Dodge
Franklin S. Edmonds
Wm. S. Ellis, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Col. J. Campbell Gilmore
C. Willing Hare
Louis B. Runk
W. Hinckle Smith
Mrs. Geo. W. Boyd
Mrs. H. N. Creswell, Edgewater Park, Pa.
Mrs. Jean S. Humrichouse, Strafford, Pa.
Miss Mary F. Stecker, Milton, Pa.
Miss Abbie Whinnery, Wind Gap, Pa.
Edmund Hayes Bell, Washington, D. C.
George Breed
John F. Moher
George F. Tyler
S. P. Wetherill Jr.
Dr. Howard Anders
Norman Grey
C. Pemberton, Jr.
Mrs. James Starr
Mrs. George Wharton Pepper
Capt. Robert Morris
J. J. Desmond, Corry, Pa.
Horace S. Harem, Radnor, Pa.
Dwight R. Meigs, Pottstown, Pa.
Brig. Gen. Wm. G. Price, Jr., Chester, Pa.
Ellwood Harvey, Wilmington, Del.
Morton Harvey, Wilmington, Del.
Edward F. Healy, Merchantville, N. J.
A. O. Dayton, Moorestown, N. J.
Edward W. Maderia
Miss Clarissa C. McCutcheon, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Kern Dodge, Germantown
Mrs. J. M. Dodge, Germantown
Miss Josephine Dodge, Germantown
Miss Dorothy Daniels, Germantown
Edward R. Meredith, Coatesville
Robert Morris

Pittsburgh—

Gen. Albert J. Logan
Chancellor S. B. McCormack
Grant Curry
Mrs. H. Wilfred DuPuy
Oliver G. Ricketson
James J. Davis
C. B. Mehard
Alexander Laughlin, Jr.
A. Rex Flinn
Joseph Dilworth
E. F. Harrison

Swarthmore—

John Dolman, Jr.

Wilkesbarre—

Gen. C. B. Dougherty
Major E. N. Carpenter
Leslie S. Ryman
Harry L. French
Wm. C. Sheperd
A. L. Williams
La Hunt
Harold N. Rust
Shepherd Ayars
Franklin B. Spry, Plymouth, Pa.
J. P. Williamson

RHODE ISLAND

Delegation representing the branch is the same as the delegation appointed by the Governor of Rhode Island.

TENNESSEE

Knoxville—

Hugh M. Tate
J. L. Bowles
Col. L. D. Tyson
R. S. Hazen
Prof. J. A. Switzer
Hon. H. B. Lindsay
E. W. Ogden
I. L. Graves
T. A. Wright
Gen. Frank Maloney
J. H. Anderson
C. A. Benscoter
George L. Price
Dr. J. D. Hoskins
A. A. Blow
Mrs. L. D. Tyson
Mrs. C. A. Perkins
Gen. D. C. Chapman
Col. C. H. Harvey
W. S. Shields
Miss Mary B. Temple

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee—

Willet M. Spooner
August H. Vogel
Richard B. Watrous, Washington, D. C.
Edward W. Frost
Mrs. Edgar N. Dickson

WEST VIRGINIA

Wheeling—

R. M. Browne
Geo. A. Feeney
Alex Glass
Ben E. Hamilton
Hon. Julian G. Hearne
J. S. Jones

Geo. A. Laughlin
Hon. Geo. A. Lutz
R. B. Naylor
A. W. Paull
B. Walker Peterson
F. C. Roderus

AT LARGE

Abbott, Gen. Charles W., Jr., Providence, R. I.
Abbott, Frank Frost, Princeton, N. J.
Adams, Walter O., Gloucester, Mass.
Addison, Arthur D., Washington, D. C.
Alexander, G. L., Schenectady, N. Y.
Allen, Andrew Hussey, Washington, D. C.
Allen, H. N., Mt. Dora, Fla.
Allen, William H., Norwich, Conn.
Alley, Gerard, Washington, D. C.
Anderson, Miss Elizabeth H., New Canaan, Conn.
Anderson, Miss Frances, New Canaan, Conn.
Anderson, Mrs. Larz, Brookline, Mass.
Anderson, R. M., Philadelphia, Pa.
Andrews, Col. James M., Schenectady, N. Y.
Ames, Mrs. C. T., Washington, D. C.
Ames, Mrs. John S., North Easton, Mass.
Arnold, Edward D., Ithaca, N. Y.
Assheton, Mrs. W. Herbert, Annapolis, Md.
Auld, Mrs. Joseph, Burlington, Vt.

Bacon, E. B., Jersey City, N. J.
Bacon, Edgar Mayhew, Wingdale, N. Y.
Bacon, Raymond F., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Baker, John A., Washington, D. C.
Baker, Capt. Laurence C., Hudson Falls, N. Y.
Baldwin, T. C., Washington, D. C.
Baltz, Harry R., Haverford, Pa.
Ballou, Mrs. Sidney, Washington, D. C.
Bancroft, Frederic, Washington, D. C.
Barhite, Judge John A., Rochester, N. Y.
Barrett, John, Washington, D. C.
Barringer, Hon. W. R., Florence, S. C.
Bartlett, Mrs. Paul, Washington, D. C.
Bauhahn, R. W., Perth Amboy, N. J.
Bayard, Mrs., Washington, D. C.
Beam, C. W., Jersey Shore, Pa.
Beaston, Hon. Richard, Tyrone, Pa.
Behrend, Edgar A., Washington, D. C.
Belmont, Perry, Washington, D. C.
Benjamin, M., Washington, D. C.
Benjamin, Marcus, Washington, D. C.
Bennett, Charles E., Ithaca, N. Y.
Bingham, Mrs. E. L., Washington, D. C.
Berry, E. E., Tecumseh, Mich.
Bestor, Arthur E., Chicago, Ill.
Bicknell, Thomas W., Providence, R. I.
Binnie, Mrs. John Fairbairn, Kansas, City, Mo.
Blach, Bryan (Capt.) New Orleans, La.
Black, Mrs. Annie E., Roxford, Mass.
Blackford, L. M., Alexandria, Va.

Blaine, Graham B., Taunton, Mass.
Blair, Mrs. Gist, Washington, D. C.
Bliss, Wm. H., Washington ,D. C.
Blunt, Miss Evelina, Washington, D. C.
Boardman, Mr. and Mrs. H. F., Troy, N. Y.
Bond, Col. O. J., Charleston, S. C.
Bourne, Prof. Henry E., Cleveland, Ohio.
Bowman, John P., Rochester, N. Y.
Bowman, Mrs. F. E., Warrenton, Va.
Boyd, Jackson Herr, Harrisburg, Pa.
Boyer, Francis B., New Bedford, Mass.
Boyles, Charles D., Hoboken, N. J.
Boynton, George H., Muscatine, Iowa.
Bradley, Charles B., Convent, N. J.
Bradley, Mrs. Charles B., Convent, N. J.
Bradley, Mrs. J. D. Cameron, Southboro, Mass.
Brehaut, Ernest, Cream Ridge, N. J.
Brennon, De Lama S., Washington, D. C.
Brereton, Denny, Washington, D. C.
Brewer, Mrs. Franklin N., Moylan, Pa.
Bridgman, Herbert L., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Brinkley, F. T., Winston-Salem, N. C.
Bronson, Miss M., Washington, D. C.
Brooke, Robert E., Birdsboro, Pa.
Brown, Miss Phyllis W., Dobbs Ferry-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Brown, Mrs. Franklin Q., Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Brown, Mrs. U. B., Washington, D. C.
Bruen, Rev. J. deHart, Belvidere, N. J.
Buchanan, Thomas, Sound Beach, Conn.
Bullitt, Hon. William Marshall, Louisville, Ky.
Burke, Thomas, Seattle, Wash.
Burnett, E. T., Roanoke, Va.
Butler, Clarence M., Washington, D. C.

Calvert, Mrs. F. H., Washington, D. C.
Cameron, Miss Margaret, Petersburg, Va.
Campbell, Arthur Bradley, Washington, D. C.
Campbell, Mrs. Francis A., Brookline, Mass.
Capron ,Mrs. Allyn K., Washington, D. C.
Carmody, Major John Doyle, St. Paul, Minn.
Carson, Byron G., Gardner, Mass.
Chamberlain, Eugene T., Washington, D. C.
Chase, Miss Edith E., Washington, D. C.
Churchill, Dr. S. E., Stamford, N. Y.
Clark, Percy H., Philadelphia, Pa.
Clarke, Mrs. Arthur E., Manchester, N. H.
Cochran, George Bond, Washington, D. C.
Cole, Ralph D., Columbus, Ohio.
Collins, Paul V., Washington, D. C.
Colt, K. Gideon, Chevy Chase, Md.
Coman, Joseph M. H., Boston, Mass.
Conklin, Howard, Monroe, N. Y.
Cooley, Dr. Mortimer E., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Cooper, John Edward, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cooper, Mrs. John, Washington, D. C.
Coover, W. T., Ames, Iowa.
Cotton, Donald, St. Paul, Minn.
Coulter, Stanley, Lafayette, Ind.
Craigie, Chas. O'H., Washington, D. C.
Cresswell, Charles T., Philadelphia, Pa.

Crozier, Gen. Wm., Washington, D. C.
Crozier, Mrs. Wm., Washington, D. C.
Crewson, W. S., Sebring, Ohio.
Crist, Raymond F., Washington, D. C.
Crossman, Frank M., South Amboy, N. J.
Crosland, Col. C. E., Fork Union, Va.
Crowell, H. H., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Culbertson, J. J., Paris, Tex.
Cunningham, Dr. R. S., Baltimore, Md.
Cushman, Mrs. Victor, Washington, D. C.
Cuthbert, F. C., Devil's Lake, N. D.
Cutler, Col. Harry, Providence, R. I.

Dallinger, Hon. Fred W., Washington, D. C.
Dancy, W. G., Baltimore, Md.
Danforth, Hon. Henry G., Washington, D. C.
Darling, W. L., St. Paul, Minn.
David, Harry Percy, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Davidson, R. P., Lake Geneva, Wis.
Day, Francis E., Milwaukee, Wis.
Devlin, Leo M., Washington, D. C.
Dexter, Mrs. Wirt, Boston, Mass.
Deyo, M. L., Washington, D. C.
Dickinson, Hon. J. M., Chicago, Ill.
Dillingham, Dr. Thos. W., Washington, D. C.
Dillingham, Mrs. Thos. W., Washington, D. C.
Dimock, Wm. De Wolf, Dixondale, Va.
Diver, James B., Keokuk, Iowa.
Doering, M. L., Albuquerque, N. M.
Drach, R. O., Washington, D. C.
Drinker, Dr. Henry Sturgis, South Bethlehem, Pa.
Drown, Orville B., Washington, D. C.
Duffy, Henry, Baltimore, Md.
Durell, Fletcher, Laurenceville, N. J.
Dwight, Mrs. Arthur S., Great Neck, L. I., N. Y.
Dwight, Mrs. John W., Washington, D. C.

Edwards, E. P., Schenectady, N. Y.
Ellis, Ralph, Camden, S. C.
English, C. Davis, Bonneau, N. C.
Evans, Miss Jane B., Philadelphia, Pa.
Evarts, Sherman, Windsor, Conn.

Falk, Miss Florence A., Dongan Hills, S. I., N. Y.
Fall, Mrs. Henry B., Houston, Tex.
Fallows, Rt. Rev. Samuel, Chicago, Ill.
Faulconer, Miss M., Detroit, Mich.
Fayerweather, Charles S., Newark, N. J.
Fell, Dr. Thomas, Annapolis, Md.
Finney, John Heth, Washington, D. C.
Fisher, Mrs. Parks, Washington, D. C.
Fishback, Mrs. Jessamine S., Ft. Smith, Ark.
Fitzgerald, Hon. John J., Washington, D. C.
Flagg, Janet W., Washington, D. C.
Flood, Hon. H., Washington, D. C.
Folsom, Miss Ida O., Exeter, N. H.
Fowler, Miss Amelia de Pau, Baltimore, Md.
Fowler, Charles, Baltimore, Md.
Frankforter, Geo. B., Minneapolis, Minn.
Frazer, Mrs. James C., Washington, D. C.
Frothingham, Samuel, Lenox, Mass.

Gaff, Thomas T., Washington, D. C.
Gage, Mrs. H. C., Washington, D. C.
Gardiner, Miss Elizabeth G., Boston, Mass.
Gardner, Mrs. Augustus (Constance), Washington, D. C.
Garrett, Robert, Baltimore, Md.
Gates, Mr. Merrill Edwards, Washington, D. C.
Gatti, H., Naugatuck, Conn.
German, Charles H. H., Ridgefield Park, N. J.
Gifford, George H., Jamaica, N. Y.
Gifford, Mrs. George H., Jamaica, N. Y.
Giles, Mrs. Clayton, Wilmington, N. C.
Glass, Hon. Carter, Washington, D. C.
Goddard, Lt. C. H., Washington, D. C.
Goodwin, Wm. B., Columbus, Ohio.
Gould, William T., Reno, Nev.
Grace, Morgan H., Great Lake, L. I., N. Y.
Graham, Arthur W., Baltimore, Md.
Graves, S. P., Knoxville, Tenn.
Greathouse, Chas. A., Indianapolis, Ind.
Green, Morris M., Columbus, Miss.
Greenbaum, Dr. H. S., Baltimore, Md.
Gregory, Charles Noble, Washington, D. C.
Griffin, Mrs. E. Harrison, South Beach, Conn.
Griscom, Mrs. Rodman E., Haverford, Pa.
Groome, H. P., Airlie, Va.
Gutterson, Mrs. Herbert L., New Rochelle, N. Y.
Gwathmey, J. Temple, Warrenton, Va.

Hackett, Wallace E., Esq., Harrisburg, Pa.
Hagedorn, Hermann, Fairfield, Conn.
Hagedorn, Mrs. Hermann, Fairfield, Conn.
Hague, Arnold, Washington, D. C.
Haines, Charles O., Portsmouth, Va.
Hale, Ledyard P., Albany, N. Y.
Hale, William Gardner (Prof.), Chicago, Ill.
Hall, Mrs. Wm. A., Washington, D. C.
Hallowell, Dr. Madeleine A., Vineland, N. J.
Hammar, Mrs. Frank V., St. Louis, Mo.
Hanrahan, Edward M., Binghamton, N. Y.
Harding, Mrs. Edward, Plainfield, N. J.
Harlan, John Maynard, Chicago, Ill.
Harlan, Richard D., Washington, D. C.
Harriman, Mrs. Borden, Washington, D. C.
Harris, Mrs. Nathaniel E. (Janet S.), Bradford, Pa.
Hart, Archibald C. (Hon.), Hackensack, N. J.
Hart, R. B., Ilion, N. Y.
Hayden, Miss, Washington, D. C.
Hayden, Robert, Washington, D. C.
Hayes, J. P., Princeton, N. J.
Heiser, C. F. A., Glyndon, Md.
Henderson, Geo. A., Harrison, N. J.
Hendricks, P. V., Bound Brook, N. J.
Hepburn, Marie, Minneapolis, Minn.
Herbert, Arthur, Alexandria, Va.
Herbert, Miss A., Alexandria, Va.
Herron, Miss Emily K., Hampton, Va.
Hight, F. S., Washington, D. C.
Hill, John Philip, Baltimore, Md.
Himrod, James Lattimore, Houston, Tex.
Hine, Charles D., Hartford, Conn.

Hitt, R. S. R., Washington, D. C.
Hobbs, Mrs. William H., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Hoffman, Wm. S., Summit, N. J.
Holbrook, E., Omaha, Neb.
Holden, Horace, Simsbury, Conn.
Hollister, Evan, Buffalo, N. Y.
Hoover, Thomas N., Athens, Ohio.
Hopkins, Mrs. Archibald (Charlotte Everett), Washington, D. C.
Hopkins, James H., Washington, D. C.
Hopkins, Nevil Monroe, Washington, D. C.
Hornbrook, Dr. Frank W., Washington, D. C.
Hornbrook, Mrs. Frank W., Washington, D. C.
Hosmer, Clarence S., Southboro, Mass.
Howard, Chas. A., Aberdeen, N. D.
Howard, John C., Ogdensburg, N. Y.
Howie, T. F., Willimantic, Conn.
Huidekoper, Frederic L., Washington, D. C.
Hull, J. A. T., Washington, D. C.
Hunt, Conway B., Washington, D. C.
Hunt, Miss Virginia Livingston, Washington, D. C.
Hutchins, E. R., Washington, D. C.

Irion, Harry, Washington, D. C.

Jackson, John Price, Harrisburg, Pa.
Jackson, Thomas D., University, Va.
Janes, A. L., St. Paul, Minn.
Janin, Mrs. Albert Covington, Washington, D. C.
Jennings, Hennen, Washington, D. C.
Jenkins, John S., Ossining, N. Y.
Jewett, Charles L. (Col.), New Albany, Ind.
Johnson, C. J., Joliet, Illinois.
Johnson, Miss L. E., Bangor, Maine.
Johnson, P. H., Rutherford, N. J.
Johnston, John White, Rochester, N. Y.
Joslyn, Falcon, Washington, D. C.
Junkin, Francis T. A., Chicago, Ill.
Junkin, Joseph De F., Philadelphia, Pa.

Kahn, Mrs. Julius, Washington, D. C.
Keith, Mrs. Julian, Warrenton, Va.
Kelley, James E., Ogdensburg, N. Y.
Kenyon, Clarence A., Washington, D. C.
King, Mrs. S. W. B., Washington, D. C.
King, W. B., Washington, D. C.
Kingsbury, Miss Alice E., Waterbury, Conn.
Kinsolving, Arthur B., University, Pa.
Kirkpatrick, Hon. T. L., Charlotte, N. C.
Kittredge, S. Dana, Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Kittridge, Mrs. John, Boston, Mass.
Knapp, R. S., Easton, Pa.
Kriebel, O. S., Pennsburg, Pa.

Lampert, Mrs. Henry, Rochester, N. Y.
Lampert, Henry, Rochester, N. Y.
Langford, A. M., Cumberland, Md.
Lawrence, John S., Boston, Mass.
Leake, Hunter C., New Orleans, La.
Le Boeuf, Mrs. Randall J., Albany, N. Y.
Lee, Miss Sarah, Washington, D. C.

Lewis, Allen F., Wilmington, Del.
Lewis, Sherman L., Akron, Ohio
Ligan, Pres. E. S., Blackstone, Va.
Lilly, William D., Baltimore, Md.
Lindsey, Miss Dorothy, Boston, Mass.
Linn, T. P., Columbus, Ohio.
Lintheimer, Dr. Edward M., Evansville, Ind.
Littauer, William, Washington, D. C.
Littauer, Mrs. William, Washington, D. C.
Locke, Miss, Boston, Mass.
Locke, Mrs. H. E., Boston, Mass.
Logan, Thomas F., Washington, D. C.
Logan, Mrs. John A., Washington, D. C.
Long, E. D., Mingo Junction, Ohio
Lyman, Mrs. Henry, Boston, Mass.

McCagg, Mrs. E. B., Washington, D. C.
McClatchy, V. S., Sacramento, Cal.
McFeely, Henry F., Wenonah, N. J.
McGill, Mrs. J. Nota (Frances M.), Washington, D. C.
McLaughlin, Mrs. John, Washington, D. C.
McNeir, Miss Mary T., Washington, D. C.
Mahlmann, Frederick G., Yonkers, N. Y.
Mahlmann, Mrs. Frederick G., Yonkers, N. Y.
Mahoney, John, Annapolis, Md.
Mahoney, Mrs. John, Indian Head, Md.
Malone, Hon. John F., Buffalo, N. Y.
Marburg, Hon. Theodore, Baltimore, Md.
Marquand, Henry, Washington, D. C.
Martin, Mrs. J. Willis, Philadelphia, Pa.
Martin, Hon. Thos. S., Washington, D. C.
Mason, George C., Portland, Ore.
Maxwell, Mrs. Lawrence (Clara Berry), Cincinnati, O.
May, Henry, Jr., Washington, D. C.
Mebane, Mrs. B. Frank, Spray, N. C.
Meiere, T. McKean, Baltimore, Md.
Meigs, John F., Wayne, Pa.
Metcalf, Jesse H., Providence, R. I.
Meredith, E. T., Des Moines, Iowa
Merrill, Mrs. G. G., Stockbridge, Mass.
Merwin, A. C., Washington, D. C.
Meyer, Mrs. August R., Kansas City, Mo.
Meyers, E. T. D., Jr., Richmond, Va.
Miller, George Douglas, Albany, N. Y.
Miller, Hon. Thomas W., Washington, D. C.
Minor, Benjamin S., Washington, D. C.
Mitchell, Francis B., Rochester, N. Y.
Mitchell, Prof. Herbert F., Laurel, Md.
Mixter, Samuel Jason, Boston, Mass.
Mixter, Mrs. Samuel Jason, Boston, Mass.
Moore, E. D., Deep River, Conn.
Moore, Mrs. Elbridge J. (Agnes H.), Washington, D. C.
Moore, R. B., Golden, Colo.
Morgan, Clarence, Shelburne, Vt.
Morse, Robert V., Ithaca, N. Y.
Morse, Mrs. Charles, Boston, Mass.
Muckle, John S., Philadelphia, Pa.
Muckle, Mrs. John S., Philadelphia, Pa.
Munger, Miss J. C., Washington, D. C.
Mutersbaugh, E. T., East Falls Church, Va.

Nagel, Charles, Hon., St. Louis, Mo.
Neilson, Mrs. Louis, Annapolis, Md.
Nelson, Mrs. Newell E., Pemberton, Minn.
Nesmith, Wm. O., Garden City, L. I., N. Y.
Newcomer, Mrs. Henry, Washington, D. C.
Newhall, Thos., Philadelphia, Pa.
Nichols, M. B., Savannah, Ga.
Nichols, Gen. E. W., Lexington, Va.
Norman, Lionel, Boston, Mass.
Norris, Mrs. Edward A. (Harriette B.), Joplin, Mo.
Norris, Isaac T., Baltimore, Md.
Norton, Dudley S., Merion, Pa.

Okie, Francis G., Berwyn, Pa.
O'Grady, James M. E., Rochester, N. Y.
O'Grady, Mrs. James M. E., Rochester, N. Y.
O'Laughlin, J. C., Washington, D. C.
O'Laughlin, Mrs. J. C., Washington, D. C.
Oliver, James H., Washington, D. C.
Olmstead, Harry, Columbus, Ohio.
Osgood, Farley, Newark, N. J.
Owen, Mrs. Thomas M., Montgomery, Ala.

Pahlow, Edwin W., Lawrenceville, N. J.
Page, Arthur W., Garden City, N. Y.
Page, Ralph W., Washington, D. C.
Parker, Edmund M., Boston, Mass.
Parker, J. J., Jr., Princeton, N. J.
Parkinson, Col. Edwin, Montpelier, Ohio
Parmelee, James, Washington, D. C.
Parnall, W. H., Atlanta, Ga.
Parsons, Chas. L., Washington, D. C.
Paton, A. R., Chicago, Ill.
Paton, David, Princeton, N. J.
Paton, Margaret A. J., Princeton, N. J.
Paton, William Agnew, Princeton, N. J.
Patterson, Mrs. Lindsay, Winston-Salem, N. C.
Patterson, Blanche B., Elmhurst, L. I., N. Y.
Penniman, W. B. D., Baltimore, Md.
Pennybacker, Mrs. Percy V. (Anna G. H.), Austin, Tex.
Phillips, F. H., Jr., Washington, D. C.
Pierrepont, Mrs. Robert L., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Pigot, Robert S., Summit, N. J.
Pillsbury, Frank H., Arlington, N. J.
Pillsbury, Mrs. F. H., Arlington, N. J.
Pitcher, C. W. L., Edgewater, Md.
Platt, Rutherford H., Columbus, Ohio.
Platt, Mrs. Rutherford H., Columbus, Ohio.
Potts, Noble Newport, Washington, D. C.
Porter, Geo. F., Chicago, Ill.
Porter, Mrs. J. Biddle, Washington, D. C.
Powell, Aimee E., Washington, D. C.
Pratt, Dr. Joseph Hyde, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Preston, Charles R., Baltimore, Md.
Price, Mrs. Ernest M., Washington, D. C.
Proctor, Arthur B., Rochester, N. Y.
Puffer, Charles Edwin, Woodhaven, N. Y.
Purdon, Miss Marina L., New Rochelle, N. Y.
Putnam, Israel, Washington, D. C.

Quertinmont, Mrs. John B., Pt. Marion, Pa.
Quigley, Hon. Geo. A., New Britain, Conn.

Radcliffe, Mrs. Wallace (Jessie W.), Washington, D. C.
Rae, Mrs. Charles W., Cambridge, Mass.
Ramlet, Miss Elizabeth C., Rochester, N. Y.
Ramlet, Mrs. Robert, Rochester, N. Y.
Randall, Blanchard, Baltimore, Md.
Ray, Frank B., National Soldiers' Home, Va.
Reavill, Mrs. Jeanette M., Douglas, Wyo.
Reed, Miss Temperance, Pelham Manor, N. Y.
Reese, Arthur F., Asheville, N. C.
Rhett, Mrs. Lowndes, Landover, Md.
Richardson, Charles F. P., Washington, D. C.
Ritter, Mrs. W. M. (Gertrude D.), Washington, D. C.
Roberts, T. L., Washington, D. C.
Robinson, C. S., Youngstown, Ohio
Robinson, D. L., Houghton, Mich.
Rodman, Walter Sheldon, Charlottesville, Va.
Rogers, Frank, Orange, N. J.
Rogers, Mrs. John J., Washington, D. C.
Rollins, Mrs. W. E., Alexandria, Va.
Roosevelt, G. Hall, Schenectady, N. Y.
Rowe, C. J., Meyersdale, Pa.
Rumball, Edwin A., Buffalo, N. Y.
Russell, Theodore F., Pottsville, Pa.
Rutherford, George A., Glen Gardner, N. J.

Sage, Mrs. Homer, Worcester, Mass.
Salisbury, Mrs. Mark S., Independence, Mo.
Saltonstall, Mrs. R. U., Boston, Mass.
Schaefer, Mrs. J. P., Bedford Park, N. Y.
Sampson, Mrs. Robert DeW., Cambridge, Mass.
Sanford, D. S., Long Island City, N. Y.
Sawyer, Miss Mary, Boxford, Mass.
Sayles, Mrs. H. H., Washington, D. C.
Schroeder, Seaton, Washington, D. C.
Scott, Edgar G., Ludlow, Mass.
Seager, Mrs. James Carroll, Washington, D. C.
Search, Lt. W. Warren, Eagle Pass, Tex.
Searls, Wellington B., Baltimore, Md.
Selfridge, Mrs. Thomas O., Washington, D. C.
Severance, Mrs. C. A. (Mary F.), Cottage Grove, Minn.
Seward, F. W., Jr., Goshen, N. Y.
Sharp, Maj. Gen. Henry G., Washington, D. C.
Shaw, Leslie M., Washington, D. C.
Sheafe, Charles M., Jr., Rye, N. Y.
Shoemaker, Col. Henry W., Altoona, Pa.
Sinclair, Robert S., South Orange, N. J.
Slauter, Henry K., Tacoma, Wash.
Smith, Anna MacL., Washington, D. C.
Smith, Carl, Ogden, Utah
Smith, J. Brodie, Manchester, N. H.
Smith, Miss Julia E., Providence, R. I.
Smith, Stuart, Baltimore, Md.
Smith, W. Conwell, Baltimore, Md.
Smith, Wallis Craig, Saginaw, Mich.
Smythe, B. E., Bronxville, N. Y.
Southgate, H. M., Chevy Chase, Md.
Speakman, William C., Wilmington, Del.

Speel, Mrs. John N., Washington, D. C.
Spencer, Mrs. Samuel, Washington, D. C.
Sprague, O. M. W., Cambridge, Mass.
Springer, E. L., Washington, D. C.
Squire, Miss Anne, Washington, D. C.
Squire, Miss Helen, Washington, D. C.
Stearnes, R. C., Richmond, Va.
Steinbach, Mrs. Edward, Cohoes, N. Y.
Steward, Redmond C., Baltimore, Md.
Stewart, John K., Amsterdam, N. Y.
Stewart, Harford T., Columbus, Ohio.
Stewart, Mrs. Philip B., Colorado Springs, Colo.
Stillwell, Elizabeth Thurston, Lakewood, N. J.
Stockbridge, Henry, Baltimore, Md.
Stockton, John T., Chicago, Ill.
Stockwell, Miss Frances T., Washington, D. C.
Sturges, H. W., Salt Lake City, Utah
Strout, Mrs. Joseph M., Portland, Me.
Sumner, E. A., Detroit, Mich.
Sumner, Mrs. E. A., Detroit, Mich.
Swanson, C. E., Madison, Wis.
Swanson, Hon. Claude, Washington, D. C.
Swearinger, J. E., Columbia, S. C.

Taff, Mrs. William W. (Agnes C.), Brookline, Mass.
Taylor, Rev. Charles F., Greenwich, Conn.
Teitelbaum, Wm., San Antonio, Texas.
Tepper, Benj. L., Washington, D. C.
Thayer, Mrs. William Roscoe, Cambridge, Mass.
Thayer, S. T., Scarsdale, N. Y.
Thomas, J. F., Philadelphia, Pa.
Thompson, E. L., New Castle, Pa.
Thompson, John R., Chicago, Ill.
Thompson, Mrs. W. O., Columbus, Ohio
Tod, J. Kennedy, Sound Beach, Conn.
Tolman, Edgar B., Chicago, Ill.
Tootle, Milton, St. Joseph, Mo.
Towner, Mrs. Horace Mann, Washington, D. C.
Townsend, John B., Radnor, Pa.
Tracy, Anne Huntington, Highland Falls, N. Y.
Trimbell, Wm. J., Rochester, N. Y.
Turner, Daisy M., Skaneateles, N. Y.
Tusting, R. A., Asbury Park, N. J.
Tucker, Mrs. Mary Logan, Washington, D. C.
Twite, N. O., Grand Forks, N. D.

Upshur, George L., Washington, D. C.

Vanderbilt, Cornelius, Norwalk, Conn.
Vedder, John N., Schenectady, N. Y.
Voorhis, Augustus M., Nyack, N. Y.
Voorhis, Mrs. A. M., Nyack, N. Y.
Voorhis, Janet McA., Nyack, N. Y.

Waddell, Mrs. Alfred Moore, Wilmington, N. C.
Wainwright, Mrs. Richard, Washington, D. C.
Walcott, Charles D., Washington, D. C.
Walton, Col. M. E., D.D.S., Huron, S. D.
Warfield, S. Davies, Baltimore, Md.
Warren, Henry Mather, Philadelphia, Pa.
Wasland, W. S., Wiscasset, Me.

Watson, Hon. Walter A., Washington, D. C.
Watson, Mrs. F. S., Boston, Mass.
Weaver, Miss Sarah C., Washington, D. C.
Webb, Henry Randall, Washington, D. C.
Webb, J. G., Clinton Corners, N. Y.
Welch, Walter, Clearfield, Pa.
Wells, Mrs. Frank N., Washington, D. C.
Wendell, Mrs. Teneyck, Washington, D. C.
Wentz, Daniel C., Philadelphia, Pa.
Werwinski, Ignatius R., South Bend, Ind.
West, Mrs. Robert D., Cambridge, Mass.
West, Harry F., Columbus, Ohio.
Westervelt, Hon. James, Tenafly, N. J.
White, Alvan N., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
White, William, Washington, D. C.
White, Capt. Wm. P., U. S. N. Retired, Lowell, Mass.
Whitehead, Prof. J. B., Baltimore, Md.
Whitney, Willis R., Schenectady, N. Y.
Wilbur, Fedora Isabel, Washington, D. C.
Wiley, Wm. H., Washington, D. C.
Willets, Mrs. Joseph H., Cold Spring Harbor, L. I., N. Y.
Williams, B. B., Mt. Vernon, Ohio
Williams, M. M., Little Falls, Minn.
Willson, Jas. W., Roswell, N. Mex.
Willson, George C., Flint, Mich.
Wilson, Clarence R., Washington, D. C.
Wilson, Mrs. Wm. L., Savannah, Ga.
Winn, Miss Jane Frances, St. Louis, Mo.
Winn, Clarence P., Philadelphia, Pa.

Winter, M. A., Washington, D. C.
Wybrant, Miss Lillian M., Mishawaka, Ind.

Yard, Robert Sterling, Washington, D. C.
Youmans, George F., Ft. Smith, Ark.

NEW YORK CITY

Abbott, Willis J.
Abbott, Lawrence F.
Abeel, F. H.
Addoms, Mortimer C.
Allen, Frederick H.
Angel, Laurance
Armstrong, David W.
Armstrong, David W., Jr.
Auchincloss, C. C.

Bache, Mrs. Jules S.
Backus, Mrs. Clinton
Bagot, Peter
Barbour, Henry M.
Barnwell, Morgan Gigges
Bartlett, Mrs. D. Dana
Barr, Walwin
Beer, Dr. Edwin
Bernstein, Mortimer Burt
Behning, Albert
Belmont, Mrs. August
Belmont, August, Jr.
Bigelow, Ernest A.
Black, George P.
Blashfield, Edwin H.
Blashfield, Mrs. Edwin H.
Bloomer, Dr. A. W.
Boardman, Henry
Boardman, Mrs. Henry
Boardman, Mrs. W. H.
Bolden, Richard M.
Bond, Frederic Drew
Borg, Sidney
Bourne, William D.
Bowman, Walker
Brainerd, Ira H.
Breed, William C.
Brooks, Mrs. Anita Comfort
Broun, Dr. LeRoy
Brown, Warren D.
Brown, Mr. Reynolds
Brown, Mrs. Reynolds
Burleigh, Mrs. George Wm.
Burlingame, E. L.
Butler, Chas. Stewart

Cable, W. A.
Caldwell, R. J.
Cameron, Miss Helen
Campbell, Miss Helen
Carlton, Newcomb
Carnahan, Geo. H.
Carter, Ernest T.
Cary, Mrs. Clarence
Casey, Edward Pearce
Chambers, Robert W.
Chapin, Mrs. Charles M.
Chisholm, George E.
Chittenden, Miss Alice Hill
Church, Wm. Conant
Clapp, F. G.
Clark, Grenville
Clark, Wm. A., Hon.
Clarke, Chas E. F.
Cleveland, J. W.
Cluff, Chas. C.
Cluff, Mrs. Charles C.
Cobb, Irvin S.
Cohen, William N.
Coleman, Charles A.
Coley, Dr. Wm. B.
Comstock, L. K.
Cooke, Hedley V.
Cox, George Clark
Crampton, C. Ward
Cross, W. R.
Cushman, Mrs. James
Cutting, R. Bayard

Davies, Julian T.
Day, Benjamin M.
DeBost, W. L.
Denegre, Walter D.
Depew, Frank
DePeyster, Mrs. J. L.
Desmond, Thomas C.
Dilmont, Frank
Dix, S. M.
Dorr, J. V. H.
Duane, Alexander
DuBois, Arthur
Dwight, Arthur S.

Eaton, J. Shirley
Edwards, O. Ellery, Jr.
Estabrook, H. D.
Erstein, Benedict

Fahnestock, Snowden
Farnam, Mrs. Charles
Fernald, Charles Barker
Fiske, Rear Admiral B. A.
Flint, Chas. R.
Fox, Horace E.
Fox, Thomas Francis
Fox, Mrs. Horace E.
Friedlander, Mrs. Rebecca

Gabriel, M. Simbad (Dr.)
Gans, Howard S.
Gans, Mrs. Howard S.
Gardner, Miss Mary A.
Garnett, E. S.
Gilbert, Cass
Goodhue, Bertram G.
Goody, Wm. E.
Grahame, Thomas J.
Greene, Francis V.
Guernsey, Henry W.
Gutterson, Herbert L.
Gwynn, J. K.

Hackett, James K.
Halsted, Mrs. E. Bayard
Hansen, C.
Harmon, C. Howard
Harris, John F.
Harrison, W. H.
Hartwell, John A. (M.D.)
Hathaway, Charles
Hawkins, Mrs. M. W. Gaston
Hawks, M. W. Gaston
Haynes, Dr. Irving S.
Henderson, W. J.
Hendrick, Ellwood
Henry Nelson H.
Herbert, F. D.
Herrick, Dr. W. W.
Hersloff, Nils B.
Hewitt, Peter Cooper
Hewitt, Miss Candace
Hill, Frederick Trevor
Hinton, George F., Capt.
Hodenpyl, Anton G.
Hollister, George C.
Holt, Roland
Hopkins, Miss Edith
Hopkins, Miss Mary L.
Hornblower, George S.
Hosmer, Mrs. E. Dep.
Humphreys, Alex. C.
Hyde, Arthur S.

Isaacs, Stanley M.

Jaches, Dr. Leopold
Jacobus, John Wesley
James, Henry
Judge, Hilliard
Judson, Albert L.

Kendall, Miss Edith
Kendall, Wm. Mitchell
Kennan, George
Kennelly, Bryan L.
Kerr, Mrs. George F.

Lambert, M.
Lamm, Major Gustav H.

Lang, Mr. Albion E.
Lang, Mrs. Albion E.
Lathers, Ida
Lawrence, Charles L.
Lawrence, Miss Rita
Leggett, Mrs. Francis W.
Levett, Benjamin A.
Lindsay, L. Seton
Littell, Joseph Reed
Lockwood, Miss Emma H.
Lowengrund, Alfred J.
Lowther, W. E.
Lusk, Graham
Lusk, Wm. C.
Luellen, L. W.
Lydecker, Chas. E.

Maas, Charles O.
Mahlmann, F. G.
Malevinsky, M. L.
Mandlebaum, Miss
Manierre, Charles E.
Martin, Mrs. H. T.
Marx, Joseph E.
Marx, Mrs. Joseph E.
Mason, J. W.
Maurer, Geo. E. (M.D.)
Mazet, Robert
McDonald, Pirie
McDonald, Mrs. Pirie
McKenney, Henry Potter
McKeever, I. Chauncey
McKercher, Clark
Mein, W. W.
Menken, S. Stanwood
Menken, Mrs. S. Stanwood
Menken, Arthur von B.
Meyer, Mrs. Annie Nathan
Miller, F. T.
Miller, J. W.
Miller, L. S.
Molitor, F. A.
Montgomery, H. P. Allen
Moore, Barrington
Moore, Benjamin
Moran, Miss Josephine
Morgan, John W.
Morrell, Miss Blanche A.
Morrell, Miss Edith F.
Morrell, Mrs. George M.
Morris, Newbold

Neilson, Mrs. Louie
Newton, John D.
Noyes, Charles S.

Oglebay, Miss Kate
Olyphant, Robert
O'Neil, Thos. B., Jr.
Oppenheimer, Joseph
Osann, Frederick
Owen, Miss G. C.

Pane, Walter
Parke, Leroy
Parker, H. D.
Parrish, James C.
Parrish, Samuel L.
Parsons, William Barclay
Paterno, Francis S.
Patten, H. R.
Patten, Harry R.
Paul, Walter
Paulding, Charles C.
Pedersen, James (M.D.)
Pennington, J. P.
Perkins, Robert P.
Peters, John P. (Rev.)
Peters, William R.
Pfluger, Miss Doretta
Phillips, A. S.
Pierrepont, Robert L.
Pigott, R. S.
Pillsbury, Mrs. F. H.
Platt, Frank H.
Polk, Dr. William M.
Pond, Col. Nathan P.
Powers, P. A. (Treasurer)
Pratt, George C.
Preble, Henry
Price, Charles W.
Prisk, Mrs. Laura B.
Pulitzer, Walter
Purrington, W. A.
Putney, Edmonds
Putney, Mrs. Edmonds

Quinby, Henry C.

Rae, Fernley R.
Rantoul, Mrs. Charles W.
Reed, Robert R.
Rees, Harold B.
Reeve, Arthur
Remington, Franklin
Rice-Keller, Mrs. Inez
Robinson, Powhatan
Robinson, Mrs. Powhatan
Roe, Arthur R.
Rogers, Frank
Roome, Rev. Claudius M.
Roome, Wm. J.
Root, F. T.
Rosen, Felix T.
Rosenberg, Ely
Rundle, W. E.

Sabine, Julius T.
Sackett, Henry W.

Sanger, Col. Wm. Cary
Sarkisian, D. M.
Satterlee, Mrs. Herbert L.
Schelling, Ernest
Schepp, Florence L.
Schermerhorn, Arthur F.
Schuyler, Montgomery
Seaman, Dr. Louis L .
Seligman, Isaac N.
Seligman, Joseph L.
Seligsberg, Alfred F.
Settle, Miss E. E.
Sexton, Robert H.
Shaffer, Jacob H.
Shaffer, Mrs. Jacob H.
Sharswood, Miss Mary
Sheffield, James R.
Sherman, Charles A.
Shields, Robert M.
Siegel, Benjamin
Simmons, A. J.
Simmons, Ralph
Sloan, Wm. U.
Sloane, Parker
Smith, Oscar J.
Speyer, James
Stahel, Edward P.
Stahel, Mrs. E. T.
Starr, Dr. M. Allen
Stephens, Olin J.
Sterling, W. C.
Stetson, Cushing
Stevens, John F.
Stillwell, Mrs. Lewis B.
Stimson, Mrs. H. L.
Stires, Rev. Ernest M.
Strauss, Manny
Strong, John R.

Tappan, J. B. Coles
Taylor, Lloyd
Tredwell, Mrs. E. A.
Tilford, Mrs. Frank
Tilton, Dr. Benj. T.
Townley, Calvert
Townsend, Howard
Tredwell, E. A.
Tuckerman, Paul

Ulman, Benjamin
Upshur, George L.

Vanderbilt, Mrs. French
Van de Water, Rev. Geo. R.
Van Kleeck, Chester M.
Van Rensselaer, Mrs. Chas.
Van Vorst, Frederick B.
Vassar, George, Jr.
Von Briesen, Miss Gertrude

Wadsworth, William H.
Wagner, T. B.
Walker, Amasa
Walker, Arthur L.
Walker, J. Bernard
Washington, Mrs. A. H.
Waterman, L. E.
Webb, Maj. Frank E.
Webb, Col. G. Creighton
Webb, J. Watson
Weeks, Dr. John E.
Weil, Dr. Richard
Wheeler, Mrs. Everett P.
Whitman, Walt.
Whitmore, C. E.
Whittelsey, T.
Wickersham, Hon. Geo. W.
Wile, Eugene C.
Wiley, W. H.
Wilson, Capt. John Clark
Wilson, J. Howard
Wilson, O., Jr.
Winthrop, Beekman
Wolbarst, Dr. Abram L.
Wood, Arthur King
Wood, C. D.
Wood, Chalmers
Wood, J. Walter
Wood, Mrs. J. Walter
Wood, Mrs. Leonard
Woods, Arthur
Woods, Mrs. Arthur

Yulee, C. Wickliffe

Zick, Mrs. Grace S.

INDEX

Abbott, Lawrence F., report of Committee on Rules and Program 20
"Agriculture and Preparedness," address by Herbert Myrick.... 209
"Air Power for the United States," address by Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary, U. S. N., retired..... 337
"Americanizing Detroit," address by Walter C. Piper, of Detroit. 104
"America's International Relations," address by Wm. Roscoe Thayer, of Harvard University 39
"America's Present Needs," address by Elihu Root, New York... 23
"A National Budget of System," address by Charles Nagel, of St. Louis 151

Bacon, Robert, remarks.....308, 314, 321, 328, 336
Benham, Ellsworth, remarks 303
Bixby, Gen. William H., remarks..... 294
Blewett, Ben., resolutions in memory of..... 285
Boyd, Robert M., Jr., remarks.....301, 304
Burr, Dr. C. B., remarks.....294, 298

Choate, Joseph H. 79
Chamberlain, Senator George E., address..... 309
Coffin, Howard E., address 231
Committee on the Congress..... 2
Committee on Resolutions 20
Committee on Plan and Scope, report of..... 21
Cosby, Arthur F., remarks 296

Davis, Abel P., remarks 164
Delegates—
At large 436
From New York City 445

Delegates, appointed by—
Aero clubs 424
Automobile clubs 425
Association American Secretaries of State..... 425
Bar Associations 424
Branches of National Security League..... 426
Colleges and Universities 405
Commercial organizations 411
Constructive New Thought Movement 425
Governors 391
Learned Societies 423
Mayors 394
National organizations 410
Patriotic Societies 416
United Nations of the World..... 425
Women's clubs 425
Dickinson, Jacob M. 7
"Diplomacy and our Navy," address by George von L. Meyer.. 69
Dougherty, Gen. C. B., remarks..... 296

Edge, Gov. Walter E., address..... 145
"Educational Preparedness," address by Frederick Winsor..... 247
Estabrook, Henry D., address 159
Remarks 178
Evans, Powell, remarks 294, 297, 300, 301, 305

Fiske, Rear Admiral Bradley A., address 64
Fletcher, Duncan A., Senator from Florida, address 118
Remarks 125, 135, 145, 150
Foreword of the Congress 13

Gardner, Hon. Augustus P., address..... 239
Greene, Robert S., remarks 257

Hagedorn, Hermann, address 135
Harding, Rt. Rev. Alfred 7
Hart, Dr. Albert Bushnell, address in presenting report of sub-committee on Patriotism through Education 278
Remarks 294

Hobbs, Prof. William H., remarks 80, 291
Holt, Robert S., remarks 257
Huidekoper, Frederic L., address in presenting report of subcommittee on Army 262
Remarks 286

Iverson, G. D., remarks 103

Jewett, Col. Charles L., remarks 292, 293, 303

Kellor, Miss Frances A. 94

Littleton, Martin W., address 328
Lytton, E. Rogers, address 111

McCook, J. J., remarks 303
McComber, I. E., telegram 179
McCormick, Hon. Medill, address 196

Manning, Rev. Wm. T., address 189
Menken, S. Stanwood—"Foreword of the Congress" 13
Remarks, 78, 277, 285, 286, 287, 291, 292, 294, 295, 296, 297, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305
Merrick, H. H., remarks 204
Meyer, George von L., address 69
Mitchel, John Purroy, address 180
Remarks 189, 203
Murchie, Guy, remarks 79, 295
Presentation of report of committee on resolutions 285
Myrick, Herbert, address 209

Nagel, Charles, address 151
"Nationalizing America," address by Prof. Edward A. Steiner, of Grinnell College 82
"Need of Governmental Efficiency," address by Hon. Medill McCormick 196
Nichols, Gen. E. W., remarks 259, 276
Nissen, Ludwig, remarks 100

Parker, Alton B., address 8
Remarks 22
Parker, Miss Grace, address 126

"Patriotism," address by George W. Wickersham, of New York.. 321
Peary, Rear Admiral Robert E., address 337
Perham, A. L., remarks 277
Piper, Walter C., address 104
"Pitfalls in the Path of Preparedness," address by Hon. Augustus P. Gardner 239
Price, Raymond B., remarks ...80, 93, 94, 100, 102, 103, 104, 111, 115

Robinson, Mrs. Douglas, remarks 169
Roosevelt, Theodore, letter 171
Root, Elihu, address 23
Rules of the Congress 21
Russell, Rt. Rev. Wm. T., invocation 159

Sessions—
First, "America's Present Needs" 7
Second, "America's International Position" 36
Third, "Americanization" 80
Fourth, "Governmental and Individual Efficiency" 117
Fifth, "Universal Military Training and Service" 159
Sixth, "Preparedness" 204
Seventh, "Patriotism Through Education" 258
Shaw, Dr. Albert, address 204
Remarks 229, 230, 239, 247, 256, 257
Small, Dr. Albion W., remarks 258
"Some Reflections Upon Our Military Experiment of 1916," address by Henry L. Stimson 50
Spooner, Willet M., remarks 64
Statement of Principles 3
Stimson, Henry L., address 50
Story, Mrs. William Cumming, remarks 36
Sub-Committee of the Congress, chairman 21
Sub-Committee on Americanization, personnel 390
Sub-Committee on the Army, report 352
Personnel 388
Sub-Committee on Governmental and Individual Efficiency—
Report 381
Personnel 389
Sub-Committee on International Relations—
Personnel 390

Sub-Committee on the Navy—
Report 371
Personnel 388
Sub-Committee on Patriotism Through Education—
Report 344
Personnnel 386
Sub-Committee on Universal Military Training and Service—
Report 379
Personnel 388
Sub-Committee on Woman's Part in Preparedness—
Report 384
Personnel 390
Sutherland, George, Senator from Utah, address 36
Remarks 50, 63, 69

Teitlebaum, W. H., remarks 229
Thayer, William Roscoe, address 39
"The Navy in Its Relations to America as a World Power," address by Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske 64
"The Spirit of Preparedness," address by Hermann Hagedorn... 135
"The State Budget System," address by Gov. Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey 145
Theobald, Henry, remarks 297
Toledo News-Bee, telegram 179
Toledo Times, telegram 178
Tyson, L. D., remarks 117

"Universal Military Training from the Standpoint of a Christian," address by Rev. William T. Manning, D. D. 189

Walker, J. Bernard, report of Sub-Committee on Navy..... 256
Wheaton, H. H., address 94
Wickersham, George W., address 321
Willys, John N., telegram 179
Winsor, Frederick, address 247
Wood, Henry A. Wise, remarks 298, 299
Woodhull, Gen. Maxwell Van Zandt, remarks 286, 287, 288
"Woman Power of the Nation," address by Miss Grace Parker, New York 126

Young, Lafayette, address 314